

P

THE UNIVERSITY  
OF MICHIGAN

DEC 20 1961

PERIODICAL  
READING ROOM

*College*

Composition

*and*

Communication

# College Composition and Communication

THE OFFICIAL JOURNAL OF THE CONFERENCE ON  
COLLEGE COMPOSITION AND COMMUNICATION

---

## EDITOR

CECIL B. WILLIAMS, *Texas Christian University*

## EDITORIAL BOARD

HERMAN A. ESTRIN, *Newark College of Engineering*; L. M. MYERS, *Arizona State University*; PAUL ROBERTS, *San Jose State College*; EDWARD STONE, *Ohio University*; PRISCILLA TYLER, *Harvard University*; PHILIP R. WIKELUND, *Indiana University*

---

Vol. XII

December, 1961

No. 4

---

|   |     |
|---|-----|
| PROJECTING THE IMAGE OF AMERICA: A PROBLEM IN COMMUNICATION<br>—George V. Allen             | 197 |
| THE PROPER TRAINING IN C/C FOR GOVERNMENT WRITING—Lee Anna Embrey                           | 204 |
| TEACHING TECHNICAL WRITING—Randolph Hudson  | 208 |
| THE RHETORIC PROGRAM AT THE UNIVERSITY OF IOWA—Richard R. Braddock and<br>Carl A. Dallinger | 212 |
| RESULTS AND COST OF ELEVEN SEMESTERS OF SUBFRESHMAN ENGLISH<br>INSTRUCTION—George S. Wykoff | 217 |
| STAFF ROOM INTERCHANGE  | 223 |
| A FRESHMAN HERESY: REVISE EQUALS RECOPY—David D. Cote and<br>Lawrence A. Ruf                | 229 |
| HOW DO YOU GRADE A COMPOSITION?—Herman A. Estrin  | 234 |
| IS ENGLISH COMPOSITION ONLY FOR AMERICANS?—Robert D. Stevick                                | 236 |
| MASS EDUCATION AND THE DEVELOPMENT OF SKILLS—Howard O. Brogan                               | 239 |
| A STUDY OF THE DEPRESSED AREAS—William J. Holmes, Jr., and<br>Robert F. McDonnell           | 242 |
| CCCC BULLETIN BOARD   | 247 |
| AMONG THE NEW TEXTS   | 250 |
| INDEX—Volumes X, XI, XII (1959, 1960, 1961)   | 263 |

---

College Composition and Communication is published in February, May, October, and December. Subscription price, \$2.00 per year, single copies, 75c. Entered as second class matter May 7, 1954, at the Post Office at Champaign, Illinois, under the Act of March 3, 1879. Orders and business correspondence should be addressed to James R. Squire, 508 South Sixth Street, Champaign, Illinois. All other communications should be addressed to Ken Macrorie, Western Michigan University, Kalamazoo, Michigan.

COPYRIGHT, 1961, BY THE NATIONAL COUNCIL OF TEACHERS OF ENGLISH

# Projecting the Image of America: A Problem in Communication

GEORGE V. ALLEN<sup>1</sup>

Today we are to consider the question of the image of the United States abroad and the problems connected with projecting that image. First, let me give a brief history of the effort by the American government to project its image overseas.

The conscious effort by the U.S. government to speak directly to the peoples of foreign countries is fairly recent—and rather startling. It is not only new for the American government but for every government in the world, all of which have suddenly, during the last twenty years, started working hard in this direction.

Traditionally, governments dealt with each other according to rather strict protocol. One government would select a small group of people, called diplomats, who acquired striped pants and took up residence in the capital of another country, where they dealt with a relatively small group of people in the foreign offices of the other government. That was the official link between governments. That was the way nations spoke to nations. If a diplomat went over the heads of the local officials and started talking directly to the people of the country, behind the government's back or under the table, the diplomat was very quickly told he was out of order. If it was an exaggerated case, he was declared *persona non grata* and sent home.

The rules by which sovereign nations dealt with each other, based on the principle of strict respect for national sovereignty, were codified at the Con-

gress of Vienna, 1815, the great Summit Conference of that day, following the Napoleonic Wars. That Congress, which had to redesign the map of Europe, set up new governments here and there, etc., was participated in by four great powers—Great Britain, France, Austria-Hungary, and Russia. Great Britain was represented by a very stiff-necked old British diplomat, Lord Castlereagh, who felt the majesty of the British Empire on his shoulders. Since Britain had led the coalition against Napoleon, he was certainly not prepared to let his country take second seat to anybody else. France, represented by Tallyrand, had just put the Bourbon dynasty back on the throne and wanted to forget the Revolution and the Napoleonic era. Tallyrand pretended that his country had once more become the France of Louis XIV. Austria-Hungary, which felt the residiary prestige of the Holy Roman Empire, was represented by Metternich, who was not willing to allow anyone to assume precedence above his most Catholic majesty; White Russia was represented by the Czar of all the Russias himself, Alexander I.

The Congress almost broke up over a question of protocol before it got started, due to the pride and jealousy of sovereign nations. Those of you who have seen the room in which the Congress of Vienna met will understand the trouble. It was an oblong room, about half the size of this one, with only three doors. But there were four great personalities present. No one would agree to step aside and enter the room in the second echelon. The contretemps was finally solved by some young third sec-

<sup>1</sup>Director, The Tobacco Institute, Inc.; Immediate Past Director, United States Information Agency. This was the luncheon address at the 1961 CCCC convention in Washington.

retary, I suppose. Anyway, somebody sent for a carpenter, who knocked another door in the wall so that at a flourish of trumpets, a page could open each door simultaneously and the great personages could each walk into the room at the same time. Nobody had to stand aside and take second place.

We laugh at that today and say that modern, 20th century people would never be so foolish. I wouldn't be too sure. You may recall that just two summers ago, when Mr. Christian Herter became Secretary of State, his first problem was to go to Geneva to meet with Soviet Foreign Minister Gromyko, British Minister Selwyn Lloyd, and French Foreign Minister Couve de Mourville. Their purpose was to try to agree on an agenda which would justify a meeting of their Chiefs. That meeting also almost broke up over a question of protocol before it got started. The problem concerned the shape of the table where they were to meet. You may recall that the Soviets insisted that it be a round table and we said it must be a square table. We knew that the first question to be discussed, when the Conference got down to business, would concern Germany. Representatives of East Germany and West Germany would be invited to come into the room so each could say his piece.

The Russians had been trying hard to get the East German government recognized as a sovereign government. We knew they hoped, in insisting that there be a round table, that when the German representatives came in, everybody would inch his chair around to make room, and the East German delegate would be sitting up at the table alongside the representatives of the other sovereign governments. We would not play this game. We said it was a four-power conference, with Britain sitting on one side, Russia on one side, France on one side, and the United States on one side,

and that was that. Again perhaps a third secretary solved the problem. At any rate, agreement was reached on an oval table, with two small oblong tables at the end. It was arranged that when the East Germans and the West Germans came in, one delegation would sit behind one oblong table and the other behind the other, and there was no way they could inch their chairs up to the oval table because the oblong tables were in the way.

Nations are still as jealous of their sovereign dignity as they were in 1815, but their method of communication with each other has been changing radically during the last twenty years. The name of your organization includes the word *communication*. Governments are now trying their best to communicate directly with the people of other countries, in every way they can. The United States has various means of doing this. The one most widely known is the Voice of America, a short wave radio program which was started during the last war. Every day we broadcast in thirty-five different languages on short wave, using powerful transmitters. Short wave is the way to reach long distances, you know. When we put a program into a foreign language, we select the news we would like for foreigners to hear, translate it into their language, and voice it on powerful transmitters with antennae directed toward countries *x*, *y*, or *z*. We are obviously trying our level best to jump over the boundary of that country and penetrate right into the living room or bedroom or cellar or wherever there may be a radio receiver.

The United States has 165 information libraries around the world. Unfortunately we do not have any in the USSR. I wish very much we could have one in Moscow. If the Russians allowed us to have one there, it would be the most thriving information library anywhere.

These libraries were started twenty years ago, in Latin America. The American Library Association had opened libraries in Mexico City, Rio, and Buenos Aires, which were taken over in 1940 by the U.S. government's Institute of Inter-American Affairs, under Nelson Rockefeller. A few years later they were transferred to the State Department, and now the United States Information Agency operates them. The famous Benjamin Franklin Library in Mexico City is perhaps our best known.

When we decide to put a library in a town, we select the most convenient place for people to step in off the sidewalk. We try to attract people by documentary motion pictures, by exhibits, by cultural programs, and by general get-togethers as well as by books, magazines, and newspapers.

When we invite anybody to come in off the sidewalk in Calcutta or Rome or Athens or Helsinki, we do not ask the local authorities if they approve of this individual; we do not even ask his name. Any Tom, Dick, or Harry is welcome. A good many Communists visit our place in Rome. Our former problem in Rome was that our only library was on Via Veneto, across from the American Embassy, in the swankest part of town. It is the most splendid library we have anywhere. I am a little ashamed of it. Congressman John Rooney used to tease me about it a good deal. The walls have beautiful leather paneling. It is in the Ambassador Hotel, as you may know. A man would not dare walk in there without a coat and tie on. He would not feel comfortable. So, we decided to open a branch library about five miles away, in the heart of the principal workers' quarter of Rome, just a block from the Communist headquarters, as a matter of fact. We took a rather modest house, fixed it up a bit with neon lights, put some books in, and made a place in the basement for exhibits and for showing

documentary films. I was there last year. It was packed and jammed although it had been open only nine months or so. It was the only place in that part of the city where Italian parents would let their daughters go unescorted in the evening. It was a thriving, pulsing place.

I visited our library in Calcutta last year. Talking with a group of Indian officials and educational leaders, I asked them how many libraries there were in Calcutta, which is one of the great cities of the world. They said, "Well, each religious group, each asram, each political party, each school, college and university has one. Maybe there are a hundred collections of books called libraries in Calcutta." But they all agreed that the United States Information Library was more vital than all the other 99 put together, in number of books lent each day and the number of visitors to the library.

There is a great difference between an American Library and any other. Europeans are beginning to send their librarians to the United States to find out how we bring people and books together. The idea of having a big show window and advertising—putting in the window jackets of books on space or whatever people are currently interested in—is rather shocking to the traditional European librarian. Their concept of a library grew out of the monasteries, where rare manuscripts were kept by a librarian whose chief duty was to prevent anybody from touching his books. He was afraid visitors would steal them or tear them or get them dirty. While we also try to preserve our books by putting plastic packets on them, we regard them as expendable. We want them to be used. We do whatever we can to bring books and people together. We have a children's room, with low chairs and tables and books suitable for their age and needs. We try to get young people started early in the use

of books. The American public library is a democratic institution which nobody in the world, including the Soviet Union, which claims to be concerned with masses of people, has even approached.

The United States Information Library is often the object of abuse. When there is an emotional wave against the United States in any foreign country, the people often vent their spleen on the easiest U.S. installation to attack, which is usually our Library. The position of responsibility in the world which the U.S. has attained makes this almost inevitable. We Americans did not try to achieve the role of leadership, and consequent responsibility in the world. It sort of happened. A British historian, Lord Macaulay, I believe, points out that the British 200 years ago did not plan the British Empire; they did not have a blueprint that said we are going out and capture this area and that area; they just picked up a little real estate here and a little real estate there, and the British Empire grew "in a fit of absentmindedness." Well, the United States is acquiring certain of the responsibilities which the British have carried for years.

I was chatting recently with a British newspaper correspondent who was twitting me about the fact that the United States Information Library seemed to get attacked here and there. He asked me how many attacks we had had in the last year. I said three—in Cypress, Bogota, and Algiers. He looked at me rather wistfully and said, "I wonder why they don't attack any of our buildings any more, like in the good old days."

One of the chief activities at our information centers abroad is English teaching. The excitement and enthusiasm all over the world to learn English is astonishing. Some ten years ago we announced we were going to start new English language classes in Mexico City and had teachers for 300, with regis-

tion to start at 9 o'clock on a given date. By 6 o'clock the line was already forming, and by 9 o'clock 3000 people were ready to sign up. They became so unruly, trying to push each other through the transom, etc., that we had to call out the police. We got a dozen policemen there to straighten them out before we started registrations. When we opened the door, the twelve policemen were the first in line to sign up.

We also had a rather interesting experience in Cairo some years ago. After Nasser took the Suez Canal, relations between Egypt and the West became very embittered, partly because we withdrew the offer for the Aswan Dam. Nasser's principal anger was against us even though we pulled the British and French and Israelis off his back. He lambasted the United States as the great imperialist power and was full of praise for Soviet Russia. We had had English language classes going on for a long time in Cairo and there was no dropping off in the number of Egyptian students who came to our libraries and to our English language classes. When Soviet political relations with Egypt became so chummy, the Soviets decided to open an information center there. They rented a fine house, fixed it up and put a big sign over it, "Soviet Information Center," or words to that effect. Nobody came. So, they sent stooges around to the American Information Center to find out what we had that they did not have to attract the crowds. The agents reported that our single most crowd-drawing activity was our English language instruction. The next week the Soviet government offered English language classes in its center!

The great desire of people all over the world to learn English is by no means due to their love of our bright blue eyes. We cannot presume that a yen to learn English necessarily means a pro-Western or pro-American attitude. In Athens, which was my last post

abroad, six thousand adults were studying English each night. They worked all day and went to English classes five nights a week, primarily to get a better job. If they could say on their job application or could tell their employers that they knew English, whether they were clerk or stenographers or whatever they were in business or government, they could classify for a high rating.

Some of you may have seen an article in the *Washington Post* yesterday reporting that the Chinese Communist government had felt it necessary to explain why it was teaching English in the public schools. Peking went to considerable length, not exactly to apologize but to explain to the people of China and of the world why English classes were begun in elementary schools. (The high schools teach Russian also.) The Chinese Communists explained that English was taught purely because it was needed for advancement in science and technology, and certainly not because the Chinese approved American or British policies. Quite the contrary. The United States was the most imperialist, dangerous, war-mongering country in the world, and their students were learning English to be able to use it to defeat us. (Our own schools explain the teaching of Russian in much the same way.)

I had a rather curious experience in the Soviet Union with Mr. Nixon two summers ago. I have not told this story publicly before and will have to withhold the name and place. When we were going through an important installation, I noticed the American Ambassador talking to a Russian girl in English. I asked him afterward who she was. He said she apparently worked in the factory. A few minutes later I found myself near her and spoke to her in English. When she replied, I commented on her American accent and asked where she had acquired it. She said, "In China." I asked a further question with my looks

and she added, "I was born in Peking and had not been to the Soviet Union until 1954, when most of the Russians were repatriated." She seemed glad of an opportunity to use her English, and without any appearance of restraint she went on. She and her mother and her little baby had been sent back. Her husband had refused to move and had disappeared. She later learned that he had gotten to Australia. She said her father had gone to the United States before the War but the family had not had any contact with him since 1939 and did not know where he was. All she knew was that he had anglicized his name, which she spelled for me and asked me if I thought there was any possibility of tracking him. I said I would try. I asked about her present activities. She said, "I am teaching Russian to Chinese engineers studying in this plant, and teaching English to Russian engineers." I said, "How do you compare the two?" She said the Chinese worked much harder than the Russians and were anxious to learn both to speak and to read. The Russian engineers were lackadaisical. "They won't speak one word in English but will try to learn enough of the written language to make out technical books in their immediate field."

When I returned to Washington, I traced her father through the immigration department and found that he was a ranch foreman in Mexico. I have communicated with him through the American Consul there and have put him in touch with his daughter. She learned English at the American YMCA School in Peking as a child. I have also talked to American missionaries who remember her.

I repeat that the teaching of English is not in itself an automatic means of bringing about closer understanding. During the last war, a few Japanese who were brought up in the United States went back to Japan and used their

knowledge of English and of the United States to spearhead certain Japanese attacks on American bases. It is often said that the Germans who spearheaded the Nazi take-over of Norway were former German orphans of the First World War who had been given homes by Norwegians and who went back to Germany and became Nazis. They could pass as Norwegians and were able to infiltrate Norway. Fortunately, such persons were a small minority. By and large, a knowledge of English tends to make people pro-British and pro-American. A knowledge of French makes them pro-French, etc.

A better means of international communication is absolutely vital. One thought has been impressed upon me increasingly during thirty years in the field of foreign relations. *Homo sapiens* has been magnificent in science and technology and in the cleverness with which he has learned to make more shoes and clothes and houses and grow food. He is now putting up earth satellites and is splitting the atom as a further proof of his scientific capacity. But I regret to say that we who have been engaged in the conduct of international relations have almost nothing to show for civilized man's efforts.

I have already referred to the intense pride with which nations insist on their national sovereignty. New nations which have just gained their independence are going to be even more insistent on keeping it and more suspicious that somebody is going to try to take it away from them than the older countries which have had their independence longer. In his international relations, twentieth-century man is in almost as primitive a state as when he came out of the jungle. Our newspapers every day give the impression that the great quarrel in the world is between Communism and Democracy. In my opinion, that is not the most important long-range problem with

which we in this room and our children and our grandchildren will have to deal. Even if Communism were to sink into the ground tomorrow (I profoundly wish it would), we would still be faced with the problem of organizing the 100 or so sovereign countries of the world, each intensely jealous, each powerful in its own realm and trying to become more powerful. As long as great power centers like Washington and Moscow exist, or small-power rivalries continue without check, clashes will take place. India and Pakistan quarrel over Kashmir. Each is trying to build up its economic and military positions so it can withstand any effort by the other to expand. The quarrels between the Arabs and the Jews in the Middle East will go on, and dozens of different problems will remain.

As long as the world is organized on the basis of strict sovereignty, we are going to continue to have international conflict, no matter whether the ideological problems are solved or not. I think ideological problems are more temporary, in fact, than the problem of sovereignty. Consequently, we are never going to have a decent, civilized world, free of the constant threat of war, until we have a world organization, including a world rule of law, an international judiciary, and an international police force strong enough to keep the peace. As a private citizen I am going to throw every ounce of energy I have into trying to achieve this end. It can only be achieved step by step, but it is man's only hope.

Here is an interesting paradox. If you go about the countryside and talk to the people in any country, they all ask, why can't we have peace? I heard that more often in the Soviet Union than in any other country. They constantly ask, "Why are you Americans threatening us with war? We want peace. We want to bring up our children and give them an education and give them a better chance than we had in life." It was true in China

when I served there, and I am sure it's true in Red China today. It is certainly true in the United States.

You may ask yourself, and I have asked myself as a government official: If people everywhere want peace, why don't their governments give it to them? It is a difficult question to answer. The more I have thought of it, the more it seemed to me that governments do not take the actions necessary to bring about a civilized international order because there is not enough grass-roots understanding and sympathy among the peoples of the world to enable their government to take the action necessary to bring about world order. Mutual suspicion and enmity are too strong. The Greeks had a word for it. We dislike the unknown, we fear it, and we hate it. The Greek word was *xenophobia*. We Americans have a certain amount of it. We may have somewhat less than others because the United States is made up of foreigners. We do not have a homogeneous ethnic or religious nation. Our diversity gives us a certain amount of tolerance for the foreign, the strange, the unusual. The Chinese have more xenophobia than any people I have been in contact with. I don't say this with any bitterness but merely as a fact. The Chinese built a great wall to keep out the barbarians, not only physically but psychologically. They did not want to have any contact with anything foreign

or strange, which was considered bad *ipso facto*.

Psychologists tell us that what we fear, we begin to hate. American GI's who came out to the American airbase in Greece arrived without any bias about Greeks. When they landed on the streets of Athens, they found it hard to get used to the fact that the people were not speaking English. Pretty soon most of these nineteen- or twenty-year-old boys would begin to dislike the Greeks and to make slurring remarks about them, calling them wops or wogs or worse. The reason was that they didn't understand Greek and were afraid of what might happen to them. Some strange policeman jabbering a strange language might pick them up and take them off to a strange place where they would not be able to communicate with their buddies. They feared, and hated, the unknown.

In order to organize the world in a somewhat more sensible basis than we have been able to manage so far, we must establish, as a first step, more widespread communication among people. If we Americans made as much effort to learn foreign languages as foreigners do to learn English, we would take a considerable stride in this direction. Meanwhile, you are making perhaps the most important contribution of all by seeing to it that Americans can communicate intelligibly not only with each other but also with the ever-increasing English-speaking population of the world.

# The Proper Training in C/C for Government Writing

LEE ANNA EMBREY<sup>1</sup>

Because any attempt to deal with matters involving the art of writing is inevitably subjective, I shall begin with a few personal observations by way of identifying myself and establishing the framework within which I shall speak. I am a writer for the National Science Foundation, an independent agency of the Federal Government. I have spent a number of years in several science agencies, where I have been called upon to write and to do editorial work in subjects cutting across all the fields of science. I received my A.B. degree from the George Washington University in this city, and I majored in English. I was graduated during the depression, and I might say that it was not at all clear to me then how I was going to earn a living with a major in English and a minor in history as the chief tools of my trade. Somewhat to my surprise, however, I discovered that even at the very bottom of the ladder there was some demand for writing skills. My earliest jobs in government were first clerical and then administrative, but at every stage I found myself writing something—in some situations, largely correspondence; in others, administrative orders and instructions; and finally more interesting material, such as reports, speeches, and articles.

A. P. Herbert<sup>2</sup> has justly observed that "those who use the most numerous words in public—that is, politicians and journalists—have the least time in which

to choose their words." This is perhaps the principal reason why over-worked public servants need people like me to organize their data and prepare manuscripts for their consideration.

Government writing has the reputation for being very bad. It is variously described as "officialese," "bureaucratise," and "gobbledygook." These epithets are by no means confined to our own Civil Service. They have been liberally bestowed by the British on theirs, with that peculiar quality for self-criticism that is so endearing. Actually government writing is probably no worse than other writing that is mass-produced, but it is more frequently in the public eye and hence more accessible to criticism and ridicule. The writing needs of the Government are no different from those of other institutions. They are for clarity, brevity, and in many instances for style as well.

Despite the fact that my own work has been in scientific and technical fields, I stoutly reject the notion that there is such a thing as "technical writing." I know that there is a very real need for people who can write precisely and clearly about technical subjects. It is, of course, an immense advantage to have knowledge of the field about which one writes, but it is not absolutely essential. During a period of several years in which I was called upon to edit rather rigorously a wide variety of highly technical reports, I never experienced any trouble with the technical language. Errors and faults that I was correcting were not technical errors but ordinary garden-variety mistakes in grammar and construction. Although I am not intimately

<sup>1</sup>Research Assistant to the Director, National Science Foundation. A paper delivered at Workshop 19 during the 1961 CCCC Convention in Washington, D.C.

<sup>2</sup>What a Word (Garden City, New York: Doubleday, 1936), p. 3.

acquainted with the wide variety of situations in which the writing of technical subjects is required—the preparation of technical manuals, for example—experience indicates that there is usually someone at hand who is acquainted with the technical matter involved and can explain to the writer what he needs to know.

I would urge instructors in college composition to drill their students in the fundamentals of grammar, construction, and style that are applicable to all writing and not worry about end use to which the skills of their students may later be put. One of my favorite quotations is the one in which Winston Churchill describes so vividly how he acquired his own matchless style. You are familiar with it, I am sure:

... by being so long in the lowest form [at Harrow], I gained an immense advantage over the cleverer boys. They all went on to learn Latin and Greek and splendid things like that. But I was taught English. We were considered such dunces that we could learn only English. Mr. Somervell—a most delightful man, to whom my debt is great—was charged with the duty of teaching the stupidest boys the most disregarded thing—namely, to write mere English. He knew how to do it. He taught it as no one else has ever taught it. Not only did we learn English parsing thoroughly, but we also practiced continually English analysis. Mr. Somervell had a system of his own. He took a fairly long sentence and broke it up into its components by means of black, red, blue and green inks. Subject, verb, object: Relative Clauses, Conditional Clauses, Conjunctive and Disjunctive Clauses! Each had its colour and its bracket. It was a kind of drill. We did it almost daily. As I remained in the Third Fourth ... three times as long as anyone else, I had three times as much of it. I learned it thoroughly. Thus I got into my bones the essential structure of the ordinary British sentence—which is a noble thing. And when in after years my schoolfellows who had won prizes and distinction for writing such beautiful Latin poetry and pithy Greek epigrams had to come down again to common English, to earn their living or make their way, I did not feel myself at a disadvantage. Naturally I am biased in favor of boys

learning English; I would make them all learn English: and then I would let the clever ones learn Latin as an honour, and Greek as a treat. But the only thing I would whip them for is not knowing English. I would whip them hard for that.<sup>3</sup>

For my own part, I urge, also, that courses in composition be strongly balanced by courses in literature. Once one has mastered the fundamentals, there is no better way to improve style and fluency than by steeping oneself in the masters of English prose and poetry. Of course, it goes without saying that one reads literature primarily for its own sake, and that its influence on style is merely a happy by-product; for those who are serious about writing can scarcely regard themselves as well equipped unless they have at their command the rich resources of English literature. One might write facilely but superficially without them, but it is difficult to imagine any writing of depth that is not somehow related to the great main stream of English literature.

Writing for the Government is, of course, largely expository, although there are some who claim that it has decidedly fictional aspects at times. Those who are interested in government careers in writing will probably want to concentrate on expository writing rather than on courses devoted to the techniques of the short-story, novels, and poetry; but here again I feel that any course which strongly emphasizes principles of good writing is useful.

Government writers need to be well acquainted with the tools and techniques of research. Probably no city in the world is richer in libraries and reference material than Washington. But one must know how to use these facilities in order to make the most of them. At least a part of a freshman or sophomore course should be devoted to acquainting the student with the nature and use of the

<sup>3</sup>A Roving Commission (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1951), pp. 16, 17.

principal reference tools. In Washington, which abounds in primary as well as secondary sources of materials, a knowledge of the proper use of each is essential. Drill in the preparation of a typical government study, appropriately documented, would be helpful.

This type of preparation leads naturally into the compilation and use of bibliographies. I have maintained a running bibliography in science, public administration, education, and other fields pertinent to my job for more than a dozen years and I use it constantly.

Another type of mechanical preparation which is indispensable is a knowledge of how to organize one's material and lay it out properly with appropriate headings, sub-headings, footnotes, and so on. It is amazing how little is known of the rather simple conventions regarding the preparation of an outline or the arrangement of sub-headings to illustrate order of importance. It is not an exaggeration to say that the full meaning of a report can be distorted or obscured by the improper ordering of headings.

Anything of more than ephemeral importance usually requires documentation. If you do not include the proper footnotes the first time around, you are inevitably called and queried regarding the source of a quotation or statement. So it saves time to put them in as you go along. Of course, one does not require the full array of scholarly paraphernalia for a brief report. Distinction should be made, therefore, between the annotations required for a lengthy formal document and the abbreviated forms to be used for shorter or less formal documents.

I once edited a report which was liberally referenced with *loc. cit.*'s *op. cit.*'s, and *ibids.* I soon became aware that there was no tangible connection between these impressive footnotes and the text; and I later discovered that the au-

thor of the report had no idea what these references meant or how to use them, but he thought they lent tone and prestige to the report, so he put them in.

A working knowledge of editorial techniques is also useful to the writer. Often the road to a writing career is opened via the editorial route; and writers, on the other hand, are occasionally pressed into service as editors. I do not believe that these talents are by any means interchangeable, or that a person who is good in one skill is necessarily good in the other. Unfortunately, however, a great deal of "editing" is being done by persons whose only qualification for these tasks is the expressed desire to perform them. Really good editors are as scarce and as talented as good writers, as the life of a person like Maxwell Perkins testifies. However, a person who is seriously interested in writing rather than in editorial work should be wary of allowing himself to become too deeply immersed in editorial work; for if he does, he may never be able to extricate himself.

The National Science Foundation estimates that around 100,000 scientific and technical reports alone are issued each year by the Federal Government. This figure does not, of course, take into account the thousands of published and unpublished issuances in fields other than scientific. Obviously, someone is writing all this material, and often it is being edited, also. It is quite apparent, therefore, that the Government's need for competent writers is very great.

Although I know that as teachers of English your main concern is for the proper preparation of your students in your own field, nevertheless I hope you will urge upon your English majors who intend to write, a wide and varied diet in the liberal arts. History heads my own list of valuable adjunct subjects. I think it would not be possible to have too much of it, and a knowledge of eco-

nomics and political science is also indispensable. Nor can one afford to neglect foreign languages and the sciences.

One can hardly hope to understand the modern world unless one is reasonably literate in science. I personally hope that the time will come when expertly-taught courses in the history of science will become widely available for students who do not intend to major in science but who will need it in their backgrounds.

In the short space of time that has been allotted to me, I have tried to stress what I believe are the essentials for all good writing, namely: a rigorous and disciplined training in the mechanics of writing; a steeping of one's mind and soul in the essence of good writing that can come only from direct and personal acquaintance with the truly great writers; and finally, background that is broad and deep in history, politics, economics, science, and current affairs. Ernest Hemingway has said that:<sup>4</sup>

Trying to write something of permanent value is a full-time job even tho the only a few hours a day are spent on the actual writing. A writer can be compared to a well. There are as many kinds of wells as there are writers. The important thing is to have good water in the well and it is better to take a regular amount out than to pump the well dry and wait for it to refill.

Fortunately, only a part of this training and background—or perhaps I should say its beginnings—need be acquired in college. Most of what a good writer

needs can be acquired by reading and observation. I feel very strongly, however, that no one should be so presumptuous as to believe that he is qualified for a job as a writer unless he is adequately prepared and experienced in his craft. A rudimentary knowledge of his mother tongue does not qualify one as an expert in English.

Speaking from my own experience, I should like to say, in closing, that I feel the rewards of a career in Government are very great. I am not sure that I should have been equally enchanted in every spot in which I might have landed, but working with and writing for scientists has been endlessly stimulating and interesting. There are perhaps some frustrations and disappointments in not being able always to speak one's own thoughts or to write under one's own name; but on the other hand, the job has given me a much wider forum than I perhaps should have otherwise enjoyed.

For one who loves words, the joy of working with them is inexhaustible. If the rapid pace of technological revolution threatens at times to overwhelm us, one can remember, as my old friend Herbert puts it, that "The power and pleasure of words are enduring and can be enjoyed by all men." It may be, as he observes, that

Before you die the aeroplane may be as out of date as the rickshaw . . . But words will still matter; and your capacity for thought and speech will still be the only quality that keeps you out of the Zoo.<sup>5</sup>

<sup>4</sup>George Plimpton, "Ernest Hemingway on the Art of Writing," *Horizon*, (January, 1959), 85.

<sup>5</sup>What a Word, p. 2.

## Teaching Technical Writing

... as regards technical writing, it is difficult to argue for inclusion of the humanities in the curriculum. The reason is that technical writing is limited in intent and scope. The purpose of instruction is not to develop the individual by acquainting him with his cultural and moral heritage. He is trained rather to provide technical information to those who would need to know. He therefore has to take the quickest and most direct route to learning.<sup>2</sup>

RANDOLPH HUDSON<sup>1</sup>

Writing as one who has independently come to accept Mr. Boltwood's conclusions, I should like in this article to extend some of his ideas from the realm of the theoretical to that of the practical, and to suggest some techniques which I have developed for upper-division composition classes to provide potential engineers with challenges comparable to those which they will encounter in their professional lives.

Those of us who teach technical writing to engineering students generally share a common handicap: few of us have ourselves taken the courses which we are teaching. Furthermore our training and even our instincts equip us poorly to evaluate the work of our students on its own merits. There is a temptation to approach our classes with hostility, with indifference, or possibly with a certain proselytizing zeal—the goal being to seduce at least a few students back to proper intellectual pursuits. Or we may attempt a compromise of sorts with our students, and give them freedom to write as they will, as long as they write for a hypothetical "poorly informed, but reasonably intelligent reader"—i.e., us. The first three reactions demonstrate a condescending attitude toward the abilities of our students; the last demonstrates our unwillingness to face the fact that in their professional lives our stu-

dents are not going to be writing for the likes of us.

One can make several reasonably valid generalizations about these engineering students who will dutifully appear for their required course in technical writing (or scientific writing or report writing). They approach the courses with mixed feelings: they are glad to be escaping temporarily from the highly demanding engineering curriculum, but they fear that their escape from a known evil is leading them into an unknown and possibly more dire one. These are students who can deal precisely with concrete things. They respect accuracy. They can think and write logically, and they already possess a considerable body of factual knowledge, which excites them and which they like to display. Having survived the most difficult parts of their college programs, they are beginning to think of themselves as professional people, but as doers not thinkers. They are suspicious of artistic, philosophical, and even scientific abstractions. (I once had a student use three pins and a piece of thread to work out in thirty seconds the rough answer to a problem that might require thirty minutes to solve by calculus.) Sensitive about their necessary commitment to anti-intellectualism, they react quickly to patronizing. They are potentially good writers, and in their professional lives they will do considerably more writing than most of us.

Their writing will not show the rhetorical excellences that inspirit us, and

<sup>1</sup>Humboldt State College, Arcata, California.

<sup>2</sup>Robert M. Boltwood, "Technical Writing—and English," *College Composition and Communication*, XI (December, 1960), 228.

requests that they enliven their style may produce hybrids of *Time Magazine* and *Mad Comics*. Their writing, instead, will at best show precision of thought, communicated with starkness and sincerity of expression. Nor is their thinking academic. We cannot get them to live long with an abstract idea—to examine its facets, to polish it, to reshape it, to admire it. I have given up asking, "What would be a good mid-term examination for the other section of this class?"—a question that involves deductions based on an understanding of the intention of the course. Conversely, a more practical question such as "Are these job interviews really important?" always elicits an extended and interesting discussion, which works through a comparison of gambits and counter-gambits into a commentary on professional attitudes. In an effort to move the thinking of one class toward the theoretical, I once asked for suggestions on how to set up an experiment to determine whether skunks which relieve their tensions by spraying are less prone to heart attacks than other skunks who keep their troubles more to themselves. Too abstract. Too far from their experience. Too many considerations. Engineering students are not at home in the world of ideas.

Since our students refuse to think like us, we must learn to think like them, if we are going to talk directly to them. After all, in the classroom they have us outnumbered. We can play on their professional pride: the difference between an engineer and a technician is that the engineer writes up what the technician does. We can show students what sorts of problems dog any writer, ourselves included, and suggest methods and attitudes to cope with such problems. (Specialized professional journals are fine sources of articles authored by men who have not successfully coped with all their writing problems.) We can give

students a feeling for what they can expect from the technical editors who may be assigned to work with them. We can help students to evaluate realistically their own writing strengths and weaknesses, and thus we contribute to their professional maturity. We can partly correct certain prejudices that engineers hold toward us, and we can offer them the opportunity to reveal to us limitations in our own thinking. Finally, we can help a few students each year to work their ideas into publishable form.

There are many available techniques. Since the classes are homogeneous, there is a place for humor: if one student will laugh, they all will. Tongue-in-cheek assignments can force students into thinking outside of their usual patterns. As an optional theme topic, students can be asked to explain how much a one-ton load of birds would weigh if at any given moment two-thirds of the birds are flying around the inside of an enclosed truck. For class discussion they can be asked, "How does one estimate the number of fish in a lake?" "Dynamite the lake and count them," a potential engineer will suggest. (A more humane solution involves catching a netful of fish and then counting, marking, and releasing the fish. The next day another batch is caught, the percentage of marked fish in the net noted, the rest marked and released—and the process repeated as the days pass. The students can work out the formula.)<sup>3</sup> A good term paper topic involves using this method to estimate the number of beans in a pan or matches in a milk bottle and then testing its accuracy. Students must de-

<sup>3</sup>I discovered this method in a monograph on the fish population of several Alaskan lakes. Engineers, of course, are often faced with the need to make estimates of all sorts, and I like this assignment because it forces them to take one such method (which they have never before encountered) and to think about its strengths and weaknesses. I assume that this activity will prevent them from ever again using a method of estimating without considering its limitations.

cide how many trials are best (after a point the accuracy *decreases* with additional trials) and they must determine what assumptions are made by one who employs this method of estimating (the random distribution of released objects being one such assumption.)

There is more to these games than may be apparent. Plagiarism is a serious problem in any upper-division composition class, and the problem is usually augmented in technical writing classes by the instructor's lack of familiarity with potential sources of material. A teacher's best defense is to insist that either (1) if the students discuss technical data, they do so to the teacher's specifications, or (2) if the students follow their usual report format, they fill it in with data related to projects assigned by the teacher.

Furthermore, the traditional library research paper should probably be eliminated—partly because of the opportunities for plagiarism which it affords, more importantly because it offers little practice for any skills which engineers will employ in their professional lives. There are many possible substitute assignments. As one who believes that students should stick to tightly limited topics, I have found about right for a 2500-word report the question, "Locally what is the best buy in toothpicks?"<sup>4</sup> Students can instead investigate rubber bands, bulldozers, lipstick, flashlight

<sup>4</sup>By the time students check the strength and splintering qualities of the shafts, note that some picks can be used on either end, consider other sorts of uses (chewing and mounting *hors d'oeuvres*), note that wintergreen-flavored picks are available, consider the feasibility of washing and re-using the plastic picks, test the durability of the points, consider the dangers in a snapping shaft or too sharp a point, calculate the percentage of defective picks and the unit cost of the good ones, note the attractiveness of the container and the honesty of the claims made thereon—by this time students find that they must be concise to hold their reports to 2500 words. One student used various brands, as he put it, "for ten minutes after a meal of peanuts." He clipped the working ends of the spent picks and mounted them on his report.

batteries, airplanes, or facial tissues and in each case determine the various uses for the products and then devise suitable tests to evaluate the various qualities of the different brands. Different types of irrigation sprinklers can be played into spaced tuna-fish cans and the evenness of the distribution checked. The accuracy of the data will be limited by the equipment available to students, but the accuracy and completeness of their thinking and the precision of their writing are subject to no such physical limitations. A student may dissect a clock and look for possible flaws in its design. One student dissected a squid instead, and concluded that although the fisherman advertised his squid as "freshly caught," this one at least had been frozen. Questionnaires are challenging and present problems to one who tries to phrase the questions unambiguously, but, being myself an experienced questionnaire-server, I suspect that most students fake their results. Another exercise has the students hike about the environs of the campus looking for an undeveloped spot of land suitable for a manufacturing plant. They are told to report back to a hypothetical industrialist the specific reasons for selecting this location for this particular plant.

My own experience, in short, indicates that almost any project which demands that the student take a long, hard look at some aspect of his physical environment and describe this look completely and accurately is more satisfactory than a long library research paper. I encourage the full development of limited topics, but no student has yet accepted my challenge to submit 2500 words fully describing a grain of sand. I have found that I can do the fairest job of evaluating term papers when three or four students write on the same topic.

Students can, however, be sent to the library for non-traditional research. One successful assignment is to have them

write book reviews on Ph.D. dissertations, chosen by the students from the library's collection. In fairness to the students, they should be told that reviewers seldom read in detail the books they discuss (non-academic reviewers at least) and that they are being permitted to be equally lax. Instead, each student is to seek out the work's main point (in theory, each dissertation contains one, not too deeply hidden), and then indicate how this point is developed. The student is asked to comment briefly on the arrangement of ideas and then on the type of documentation (lab experiments? old documents? responses to questionnaires? abstract thought?). Finally, he is to assume that the thesis has been established (unless he is able to show that it has not been, which is unlikely) and subject this hypothesis to a new set of questions such as "What precisely has the author contributed to knowledge in this field?" "Who should know about this contribution?" "Why?"

A student can also be sent to the library to peruse one of the most charming of periodicals published today, a monument to man's industry and to his desire for recognition, immortality, and money—*The United States Patent Office Gazette*.<sup>5</sup> One interesting exercise has the student select a firm in which he is interested, check in the *Patent Office Index* the serial numbers of recent patents held by this firm, and then find brief descriptions of these patented articles in the *Gazette*. He can then write on the question "What is ..... Co. up to

these days?" He can also overwhelm an interviewer from ..... Co. by informed references to recent inventions patented by this firm.

There is much more that can be done with the course. Martin Gardner's puzzles (which appear monthly in *Scientific American*, and which were best for our purposes about three years ago) can be assigned as optional theme topics, or they make fine assignments for voluntary speeches. My own policy is to allow up to three students to speak on the same puzzle, with subsequent speakers being kept out of the room. Thus we in the audience can compare techniques, and often during the second or third speech we discover that we all know more about the solution to the puzzle than the confused explainer. The question-and-answer period can be very interesting.

More humdrum theme assignments can involve the students in certain never-ending arguments—comparisons and contrasts between records and tapes, reflex and 35mm cameras, alternate chess openings (or bids on an assigned bridge hand, or plays on an assigned poker hand), or, of course, big cars and little cars. Students can define the area of knowledge covered by their major field. (This topic has its shortcomings, but I have yet to come up with a definition theme that does much better.) Students can report (in formal report form) precisely what they have accomplished during the past day (or week, or month). Students can classify types of breakage possible in an industrial process, or types of error possible in a complex experiment. As a final essay they can write on a moral problem which they, as engineers, will face. (This topic is too abstract for their comfort, and they need considerable help with it.) My own policy for a class that meets three times a week is to have students submit 7000 words during the quarter, the topics being selected by them from among my

<sup>5</sup>The *Gazette* is issued bi-weekly and contains brief descriptions of patents, listed by serial number. Anyone may obtain the complete text of recent patent applications by sending the patent number and 25 cents to the U.S. Patent Office, Washington, D.C. The two applications in my possession cover a Portable Pie Container (No. 2,798,784) and a Magnetic Tooth-Brush Holder (No. 2,798,241). I distribute dittoed copies of these as models, and ask students to put their own ideas (or descriptions of household gadgets) into the same form. This is a nice exercise in precise description.

suggestions, and the themes being submitted at their individual convenience (subject to certain ground-rules).

Written work should be evaluated according to how complete and how logically structured the thinking is, and according to how accurately the writing communicates the data and fixes the main idea in the reader's mind. In my opinion a teacher cannot in clear conscience ban technical terminology (which we like to call "jargon") unless he can think up a standard English synonym for the suspect locution. A teacher must accept the fact that his students are learning to master their technical vocabularies, and he should encourage them to seek out the precise words which have been devised to describe specific referents.

Certain themes will be hard to follow, but a teacher's problems grow simpler after the first time through the course, as certain stock ideas begin to re-appear regularly. All goes reasonably well until someone tries to explain how to program a computer, or until a graduate student

in nuclear physics enrolls in order to receive help with his dissertation.

A teacher should probably encourage his students to reflect their logical thinking through the liberal use of sub-heads and devices such as graphs, charts, and diagrams.<sup>6</sup> If he insists on conciseness, he must compromise some of his ideas about paragraphing, but he may demand that writing be mechanically correct. Those of us who are trained in the humanities presumably respect the ability to draw conclusions logically and honestly, and the ability to state these conclusions accurately and emphatically. As instructors of composition, we are in a position to help our engineering students to respect these abilities of the human mind. In the process, our students will be equipping themselves to meet the exacting challenges of their professions.

<sup>6</sup>Here more than anywhere else a teacher who is not familiar with the practice of technical writing needs assistance. Several handbooks of technical writing explain in detail accepted methods for handling such devices.

## The Rhetoric Program at the University of Iowa

RICHARD BRADDOCK and CARL A. DALLINGER<sup>1</sup>

Every year the Rhetoric staff at the University of Iowa analyzes and evaluates some 30,000 themes and 22,000 speeches. They are produced by the more than 2,000 freshmen who enter the University each fall and who, except for the few who are excused from the requirement, must take Rhetoric.

Combining the traditional freshman courses of composition and public speaking, the Rhetoric Program (known until September, 1961, as the Communication Skills Program) was established

in 1944 "to provide the degree of skill in writing, speaking, and reading that is necessary for effective participation in both college and non-college life, and furnish a basis for subsequently increased skill in these respects as knowledge and experience are enlarged." The name of the Program has been changed to "Rhetoric" to reflect the dropping of required sub-freshman work several years ago and to avoid confusion of the Program with the Communication Center, the building which houses the School of Journalism.

<sup>1</sup>University of Iowa.

A wide range of ability and experience in writing, speaking, reading, and listening is observed among the freshmen who come to the University. Some have attended schools where five large English classes are assigned to a teacher who has little preparation and less zeal for struggling over compositions every night, where students receive no directed experience in public speaking or group discussion, and where standards of performance in these matters are overshadowed by school interest in "practical" courses and extra-curricular activities. Sometimes such students have the native ability to do well but, with mediocre elementary and secondary school preparation, have much to learn before they can speak, write, and read at a college level.

Other entering freshmen—still a small minority—have come through schools where writing and speaking have been stressed through the twelve years, where college-bound students have taken an intensified twelfth year course in which they have been challenged to read, speak, and write about ideas of some significance and to work toward standards approaching those usually expected in the first year of college.

### Sectioning

One of the principal tasks of the Rhetoric Program is to provide courses for students of varying proficiency. Using the results of the American College Testing Program examinations (taken by high school seniors), the University Examination Service makes a preliminary classification of each entering freshman. This classification is used by the Admissions Office to notify each student whether he should enroll for 10:1 (the first semester of the regular two-semester course) or 10:3 (the accelerated, one-semester course for the top fourth of the freshman class). Each of these is a four-hour course, as is 10:2, the sequel to 10:1. If the student's test scores are in

the top 10% for entering freshmen, his Admission Statement indicates that he is eligible for assignment to an honors section; if his score in writing or reading is in the bottom 20%, his Admission Statement indicates that he should enroll for voluntary, non-credit remedial work in addition to 10:1. (Additional details of these testing and sectioning procedures may be found in Carl A. Dallinger's chapter on "The Communication Skills Program at the State University of Iowa" in *Communication in General Education*.)<sup>2</sup>

During the first days of the semester, each student in 10:3, the accelerated course, writes a theme and delivers a speech, each of which is rated by several instructors. If a student ranks in the top 5% of the freshman class in these performance and objective tests, he is exempt from the Rhetoric requirement and may transfer immediately to a literature core course or some other course of his election. Some literature instructors maintain that the writing of these exempted students is not polished enough to warrant exemption, and some students refuse the option of exemption, but the Rhetoric Program continues to offer the option for several reasons:

1. Exempted students should be proficient enough to improve their writing from the suggestions given by instructors in other courses requiring term papers and essay examinations. Unfortunately, few exempted students receive any such suggestions for the improvement of their speaking.

2. Exempted students may elect Advanced Expository Writing or some other writing course. Similarly, they may elect a course in public speaking. If an honors student seems proficient in reading and writing but not in speaking, it is recommended that he take a two-hour

<sup>2</sup>Francis Shoemaker and Louis Forsdale, eds. *Communication in General Education* (Dubuque, Iowa: Wm. C. Brown Co., 1960).

speaking course instead of the four-hour 10:3 requirement.

3. The desire to have their students exempted acts as a stimulus and reward to high school English and speech teachers and to high school students who are anxious to accelerate their work in college.

As is shown in Table 1, approximately 96% of the freshmen take Rhetoric.

| Table I<br>Placement of Students in Rhetoric<br>September, 1960 |        |          |
|---|--------|----------|
|   | Number | Per Cent |
| Exempted  | 84     | 4        |
| 10:3  | 447    | 22       |
| 10:1  | 1527   | 74       |

#### Nature of the Course

Instruction in the course is designed to teach students to focus their writing and speaking on a main idea "narrow" enough for meaningful development, to organize their ideas clearly, and to support them with facts, examples, and valid reasons. During the first part of the course, the emphasis is on exposition; during the second, on argumentation.

Instruction is also given in the particular "skills": in writing—controlling the finer points of sentence structure and punctuation; in speaking—developing audience "contact," using visual aids, and improving vocal delivery and gesture; in reading—outlining, skimming, and summarizing textbook selections and articles in periodicals; even in listening—taking notes on and criticizing lectures and student speeches. Instruction in the use and documentation of library reference materials is given students in 10:1 and early in 10:3; instruction in the writing of a research paper comes in 10:2 and in 10:3.

The Program includes elementary study of the nature of the English language—its history, its varieties of usage, its meaning (semantics and logic), and its use in mass communication. This subject matter is limited by the need for

primary emphasis on instruction in writing, speaking, reading, and listening. Still, the course is more than a "skills" course; it is better described as a course in the knowledge and application of rhetorical principles.

We think that one way in which the Program at the University of Iowa compares favorably with those of many other colleges is that it requires a minimum each semester of eleven themes, eight speeches, ten assignments designed to help students improve their reading, and ten their listening. Keeping class size to an average of 22 and a maximum of 25 students has permitted maintenance of these minimum requirements and a generous amount of consultation with individual students.

#### Exemption Procedures

When the student completes his one-semester or two-semester course, he must demonstrate his proficiency in writing and speaking in actual performance, rated by at least two instructors other than his own. He must also demonstrate proficiency in reading. If he is deficient on one or more of these final examinations and if his instructor cannot attest that regular satisfactory class performance seems more representative of his proficiency than a slight deficiency on the final tests, the student is "held" for a two-hour course in each "skill" in which he is deficient—writing, speaking, or reading. He must continue in each remedial course for which he was held until he can pass the examination he previously had failed. Although the student is graded in these remedial courses, he cannot count more than eight hours of Rhetoric toward his graduation requirements.

Although the Program was not established for this purpose, it inevitably functions as a screening course. Some faculty members who require papers and essay examinations in other courses have questioned whether or not the screen is

of fine enough gauge. The facts concerning the satisfying of the Rhetoric requirement present one answer: approximately 58% of the students who begin the course complete it and satisfy the requirement without taking subsequent remedial work. Even some 22% of the entering accelerated students are required to take remedial work before they

have finally satisfied the requirement.

Table 2 presents an example of how all of the students fare at the end of the course.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>3</sup>The proportions of students enrolled in 10:1 and 10:3 were unrepresentative in 1959-60, when we were using the American College Testing Program examinations for the first time and had not perfected the formula used for sectioning. Usually the proportions more closely resemble those in Table 1.

Table 2  
Disposition at End of Course of Students Enrolled  
in 10:1 or 10:3 at Midterm, Fall, 1959

|  | Regular<br>10:1-10:2 Students |          | Accelerated<br>10:3 Students |          |
|--|-------------------------------|----------|------------------------------|----------|
|  | Number                        | Per Cent | Number                       | Per Cent |
| Withdrew before finals<br>(or failed 10:1)   | 209                           | 19       | 43                           | 6        |
| Exempted without additional<br>remedial work | 558                           | 50       | 485                          | 70       |
| Held for more writing                        | 134                           | 12       | 63                           | 9        |
| Held for more speaking                       | 47                            | 4        | 58                           | 8        |
| Held for more reading                        | 35                            | 3        | 3                            | 0        |
| Held for 2 or 3 remedial courses             | 89                            | 8        | 17                           | 2        |
| Required to repeat 10:2 or 10:3              | 32                            | 3        | 21                           | 3        |
| Incomplete                                   | 4                             | 0        | 2                            | 0        |
| Total enrollment at fall midterm             | 1108                          |          | 692                          |          |

About half of the students held for remedial work actually continue in college, complete the additional work, and pass the examination at the end of one extra semester. A few—in the past known by the students as “Comm Skills majors”—take remedial work in writing many times before they pass the theme examination or withdraw from college. Sometimes such a student perseveres in the Writing Laboratory into his junior or even his senior year. Then, if his writing almost meets the usual standards, the Program may pass him, reasoning that the general level of his other college work has proved itself satisfactory to a substantial number of faculty members in several departments.

### In-Service Training

As with any department, the success of the Rhetoric Program is largely dependent on its staff. Totaling over 75

during the fall semester, when enrollment is higher, all members of the staff except eight regular faculty members are graduate students. Very few graduate students are permitted to teach full time; most teach one-third time (one class each semester, at a nine-month salary in 1961-1962 of \$1550) or one-half time (two classes in the fall semester, one in the spring, at a nine-month salary in 1961-1962 of \$2250). Approximately two-thirds of the graduate students are working toward master's or doctor's degrees in English; one-third are studying for the Ph.D. in speech or in dramatic arts; three or four who teach only in our Reading Laboratory are taking advanced degrees in the College of Education. More than half of the graduate students have taught for several years before joining the Rhetoric staff. Several have substantial publication records.

Because few staff members have taught writing, speaking, and reading in an integrated course before joining the staff and because the turnover on the staff may be as high as 50% in any one year, the Program has developed several training procedures. Weekly staff meetings anticipate the problems new staff members will face for the first time and provide practice sessions in analyzing and evaluating themes and speeches according to defined standards. Syllabi outlining the general nature of the 10:1 and 10:2 courses and offering detailed assignments are distributed to staff members and sold at cost to students.<sup>4</sup> Outlines suggesting class procedures and assignments are distributed weekly to new staff members teaching 10:1. When themes and speeches are being rated for placement or final examinations, a new staff member is paired with an "old" one, a person whose major interest has been in speech with one in English. It is easy to see why the experience of teaching in the Program is invaluable to the graduate seeking a teaching position on another campus.

### Administration

The Rhetoric Program has a unique administrative organization; it is a non-departmental unit directly responsible to the Dean of the College of Liberal Arts, Dewey B. Stuit. There are no "competing," parallel programs on campus, as there are in some institutions. The Coordinator of the Program, Carl A. Dallinger, is the Speech Supervisor as well. This means that he works closely with the Department of Speech and Dramatic Art, of which he is a member, in granting teaching appointments in Communication Skills to graduate students in that area. The Writing Supervisor, Richard Braddock, works in a similar capacity with the Department of English. The

Reading Supervisor, William Eller, is Director of the Reading Laboratory in the College of Education.

Building upon the course pattern originally adopted by the faculty and carried forward under the leadership of John Gerber, who was Coordinator and Writing Supervisor during its first eleven years and is now the new Chairman of the Department of English, the Program is continually evaluating its efforts. Two years ago, after studying the effectiveness of its two-hour remedial course required of substandard entering freshmen, the Program replaced that requirement with voluntary, non-credit laboratory work, shouldering the weak student with the responsibility of making up his deficiencies. The Speech and Writing Supervisors also utilize class observation and student reaction blanks to help new instructors assess and improve their teaching.

One device which the Program uses indirectly to evaluate its instruction is the familiar "orange slip," provided in quantity to any University professor who wishes to stimulate his students to maintain and build upon the writing standards established in the Communication Skills course. Headed boldly "THE WRITING IN THIS PAPER IS UNACCEPTABLE," the gummed slip may be affixed to any paper or essay test which shows deficiency in writing. If the professor checks the first of three boxes on the slip, the student is advised that his weak writing seems to stem from carelessness and that he should edit his papers more carefully before he submits them. If the professor checks the second box, the student is informed that his writing was so poor that his grade on the paper or test was affected and that in the future he should plan his papers before he begins writing, take more time to word them precisely, and edit them with care. If the third box on the "orange slip" is checked, the deficient upperclass-

<sup>4</sup>The pair of syllabi may be purchased for one dollar from Campus Stores, University of Iowa, Iowa City.

man is referred back to the Rhetoric Program for remedial help.<sup>5</sup> We are relieved that relatively few professors resort to the third box and that almost two-thirds of such referrals are students who received their composition instruction at other institutions.

The supervisors try to utilize every opportunity to work with secondary school teachers to improve the preparation of students for college writing, speaking, and reading. Last summer they directed a workshop for high school and college teachers on "Preparing High School Stu-

dents for College Composition," and frequently they speak and write on similar subjects for local, state, and national meetings of secondary school teachers of English, speech, and reading. The Writing Supervisor recently took a leading role in getting certification standards raised for beginning Iowa high school English teachers.

But the supervisors have little hope that entering freshmen will soon come so well prepared that the Rhetoric Program will have nothing more to do. They find that the typical student needs continuous help in refining his ability to read, speak, and write as he deals with more and more complex ideas at succeeding stages of his education.

<sup>5</sup>This remanding procedure, not original at the University of Iowa, first came to our attention in James B. Stronks' "Some Faculty-Wide Help for the English Teacher," *College English*, XX (November, 1958), 86-87.

## Results and Cost of Eleven Semesters of Subfreshman English Instruction

GEORGE S. WYKOFF<sup>1</sup>

### Purpose

The facts and figures summarized below suggest answers to four questions:

1. How many subfreshman English students in college composition courses remain (a) to take the first semester of regular college composition, (b) to take the second semester of required composition, and (c) to graduate?
2. What is their achievement in the college-calibre required composition courses?
3. How much, in dollars, does the subfreshman English course cost?
4. Is there value in segregating poorly prepared students in English and offering them special remedial instruction?

### Scope

This study examines the record of 2,461 subfreshman English students, at Purdue University, over 11 semesters, chosen from the second semester of the academic year 1945-1946 through 1953. Ending the listing of subfreshman students in that year allowed sufficient time to check available records showing how many of these former students graduated in the normal 4 years, or in 5 or 6 years. For these 11 miscellaneous semesters, the case studies include mature though badly-prepared-in English ex-G.I. students (during the post-World War II bulge), and, later, high school graduates going immediately to college. Over the 11 semesters also, numerous teachers were involved, with the pre-

<sup>1</sup>Purdue University.

sumed result that the statistics are likely to be reliable, since grade differences would or should average—grades of teachers who grade leniently being compensated for by grades of teachers who grade severely.

### Definition of Terms

English 1—a one-semester course for poorly-prepared in English first-year students. The course was non-credit, but students who earned a higher-than-minimum-passing grade received credit for regular freshman composition.

English 101—a one-semester course in English composition, carrying credit, and taken by the majority of entering students: those too well prepared to be put in the subfreshman course and those not well enough prepared to be assigned to Advanced Freshman Composition sections.

English 202—a one-semester course in English composition, carrying credit, and taken by students who successfully passed English 101. Depending upon the school of specialization in which the student was enrolled, one or more semesters intervened between English 101 and English 202, allowing for increasing maturity of the student.

The grades used: A, B, C, D, (all passing, but in descending order, D being the minimum passing grade); E, conditioned, but not demanding repeating of the course; F, flat failure, course to be repeated.

### Procedure

Records (3x5) cards) were kept course by course and semester by semester for each student; that is, a card was made for an English 1 student and filed according to the semester and year of enrollment; when the student enrolled in English 101, another card was made out, and similarly filed; when the student enrolled in English 202, another card was made out, and similarly filed.

From these cards it was possible to learn:

1. How many students were enrolled in English 1 and their record there.
2. Which English 1 students received C or higher in English 1 (therefore, credit for English 101), and their record in English 202.
3. Which ex-English 1 students enrolled in English 101 and their record there.
4. Which ex-English 1 students enrolled in English 202 and their record there.

From the Purdue Alumni Association Office, information was obtained concerning (1) which ex-English 1 students having successfully completed English 101 and 202, went on to graduation; (2) how many years elapsed between first enrollment in college and graduation.

### Results

In considering the results below, the reader should remember that English 1 is subfreshman, non-credit English; English 101, regular freshman English composition; and English 202, a second-semester English composition course after the freshman year. Also, that passing grades are A, B, C, D (minimum passing), that E is a conditional, failing grade, that F is completely failing. The results showed the following:

#### *English 1 Students in English 1*

Total number of entering freshmen enrolled in English 1: 2,461, or 15% of all the entering freshmen for the 11 semesters. Number of students passing English 1: 1,699, or 69%. (Included is the number of students who had high enough grades in English 1 to receive credit for English 101; the number was 272, or 11%. Number of students passing English 1 but not receiving credit for English 101: 1,427, or 58%.)

Number of students failing English 1: 762, or 31%. (Included as failures were

86 students who withdrew from the course or from the University.)

#### *Ex-English 1 Students in English 101*

Of the original enrollment, 2,461 students, in English 1, 1,677 students or 68% took English 101. These included those who passed as well as those who failed English 1,<sup>2</sup> and also 10 students who apparently did not know that they had received credit for English 101 through higher grades in English 1.

The drop from English 1 to English 101 was 784 students, or 32%. This loss, however, included the 262 who did not take English 101 because of their having obtained credit for it in English 1 with a higher-than-minimum-passing grade. Those, then, who actually did not take English 101 but presumably dropped out of the University numbered 522, or 21%, of those originally enrolled in English 1. It is possible that some of these students may have transferred to other colleges, eventually made their grades, and graduated, but of such we have no records.

Of the 1,677 ex-English 1 students in English 101, 1,330 passed, or 79%; 347 failed, or 21%. "Passing" includes those who received conditions (a grade of E) and later removed them; it also includes those who passed after taking the course more than once.

Concerning the repeaters: 186 ex-English 1 students (11% of the 1,677 ex-English 1's who enrolled in English 101) took English 101 more than once. One hundred sixty-seven took the course twice; 107 then passed, and 60 failed. Seventeen took the course three times; 14 then passed, and 3 failed. Two students took English 101 four times and finally achieved a D. Presumably the 63 who failed after the second or third at-

tempt gave up and withdrew from the University.

To the 1,330 who passed English 101 should be added the 262 ex-English 1's who received credit for English 101 through higher grades in English 1. Thus, 1,592 ex-English 1 students passed or received credit for English 101, or 65% of the 2,461 freshmen who were originally enrolled in English 1.

#### *Ex-English 1 Students in English 202*

Of the 262 students with C's or better in English 1 who were eligible for English 202, only 189 enrolled. Of the 1,330 ex-English 1 students who took and passed English 101 and were eligible for English 202, only 890 enrolled.

Thus, 1,592 ex-English 1 students—those who passed English 101 or received credit for it by their higher English 1 grades—were eligible to enroll in English 202. But only 1,079, or 68%, of those eligible enrolled, and only 44% of the original enrollment of 2,461 English 1 students.

Of the ex-English 1 students enrolled in English 202 (1,079 students), 1,033 passed, or 96%, and 46 failed, or 4%. Of the original 2,461 English 1 students, 42% thus fulfilled Purdue's requirements of 6 hours of written composition. "Passing" includes those who received conditions (a grade of E) and later removed them; it also includes those who passed after taking the course more than once.

Concerning the repeaters: 38 ex-English 1 students (3½% of the 1,079 ex-English 1's enrolled in English 202) took English 202 more than once. 32 took the course twice; 31 then passed, and one failed. Five took the course three times; three then passed, and two failed. One student took English 202 four times and finally achieved a D. Totals: of the 38 repeating English 202, 35 eventually passed, 3 failed. Presumably, the three who failed after the second or third attempt gave up and withdrew from the University.

<sup>2</sup>Failing English 1 students could not be required to repeat the course, but were allowed to enroll in English 101; however, in the first six of the semesters covered by this study, 10 students followed their instructors' advice and took English 1 for the second time.

### Graduation

Of the 2,461 students who began their college work with subfreshman English, 886, or 36%, persisted through English 1, 101, 202, and other necessary courses for graduation.

Of these 886, there were 653 who, although behind one semester in English because of subfreshman English 1, made up their deficiencies and graduated in 4 years; 146 graduate in 4½ to 5 years; and 87 took longer than 5 years.<sup>3</sup>

On their way to graduation, 79 ex-English 1 students repeated English 101; 67 repeated the course once (i.e., took it twice); 10 repeated it twice (i.e., took it three times); and two students repeated it thrice (i.e., took it four times).

On their way to graduation, 30 ex-English 1 students repeated English 202; 26 repeated the course once (i.e., took it twice); three repeated it twice (i.e., took it three times); and one repeated it thrice (i.e., took it four times). Five eventual graduates took both English 101 and English 202 for the second time or more.

Of the 272 ex-English 1 students who received credit for English 101 through sufficiently high English 1 grades, 189 appeared in English 202, and 151 (or 55% of the 272 went on to graduate.

### Grades Made by Ex-English 1 Students in English 101 and English 202

Such (i.e., the figures given above) are pertinent results, in so far as the purpose of this study is concerned. The following statistical information answers questions concerning the percentages of the different grades earned by ex-Eng-

lish 1 students in English 101 and English 202.

In English 101, ex-English 1 students received the following grades: A, 0%; B, ½ of 1%; C, 21½%; D, 48%; E (conditioned), 10%; F (completely failing), 20%.

In English 202, ex-English 1 students received the following grades: A, 0%; B, 7%; C, 45%; D, 40%; E (conditioned), 2%; F (completely failing), 6%.

### Cost

Perhaps the word *cost* in this study is misleading, for there is no accurate method of computing the cost of English 1 (subfreshman English). During the study, class size and salaries changed, and there are now no means of knowing how many students were put in each English 1 class, who taught these students, or what the average salaries of teachers then were.

There are other complicating factors: for example, if there had not been a subfreshman English 1 and if the 2,461 English 1 students had been placed in English 101, there are no means of knowing whether they would have been absorbed in regular classes by increasing class size, or whether an additional number of classes (equivalent to the number of English 1 classes) would have been scheduled. We do not know how many students, with the incentive of credit for all students (unlike English 1, which was non-credit) would have passed English 101. We do not know how many who might have failed English 101 the first time would have passed the second time (equivalent to ex-English 1 students passing English 101). We do not know how many would have tried the third time (of course, in some institutions, students failing a course the second time are automatically dropped; at Purdue, the procedure has been to charge an additional fee for a course taken after the second time). We do not know how

<sup>3</sup>No reliable figures are available here on the length of time required for graduation. The figures given are based on the year of college entrance and the year of graduation, but it is possible that some of the 5- or 6-year people dropped out for a semester, or two, or more, and then returned. From the self-filled-out-by-graduates cards in the Purdue Alumni Association Office, one gets the impression that most students graduated in 4 years, or 4½ years.

many possible 1 students, given their chance in English 101, would eventually have reached English 202 and graduation, for we have not had a control group to check by: i.e., poorly prepared students put in and followed through English 101 (without any extra assistance, such as writing laboratory) and English 202 to graduation.

If we assume that the cost of English 1 was limited to only the extra semester of English instruction, that class size was kept at 23 or 24 (larger or smaller classes would naturally change the cost estimate), that the average salary of instructors of such students might be set at about \$4,600 a year<sup>4</sup> (again, a lower or higher estimate would change the cost estimate), and that the teaching load was four classes a semester or eight classes a year—then these 2,461 students make about 104 sections, and at eight sections per instructor a year, with 13 instructors needed at \$4,600 a year salary, the cost of English 1 instruction of students included in this study was \$59,800, an average of \$5,436 a semester or \$10,972 a year—an average of \$24.30 per English 1 student enrolled. At present salary scales, the cost would be greater.

If total cost is limited to the 886 poorly-prepared-in-English students who eventually graduated, the cost per student for one extra semester of instruction in English was \$67.50, a surprisingly low figure. Whether or not it is or was economically justifiable to spend this amount or a total of \$59,800 cannot be answered, any more than can the economic question of financing in our colleges the education of entering freshmen who will not be around at graduation time four years later. A strictly scientific and economic answer may be

NO—that science should devise some means to weed out all non-graduates before they register as freshmen!

### Conclusions

From the foregoing results, some conclusions may be drawn concerning cost, percentages of graduates, and estimate of value of subfreshman English.

*Cost.* Certain uneconomic, intangible factors enter. Many students, perhaps, even though they flunk out or drop out early or later, are grateful for the chance of learning that they have had their opportunity for a college education and did not measure up. They are not necessarily destined to be financial failures, and even economically the University may benefit by their having been enrolled, partly because any university may welcome financial gifts from former students (non-graduates) and partly because such ex-students may influence others favorably toward financial aid for the University. Also, academically and scholastically, they may pay part of their debt in seeing that their younger brothers and sisters, and, later on, their children, are given the preliminary educational background that will assure them places among the 35% to 40% or more of entering freshmen who "make the grade" and eventually graduate.

*Percentage of Graduates.* Even the number and percentage of ex-English 1 graduates of Purdue University (886 students—36%) are somewhat surprising, according to samplings of some of the not-too-frequent studies at other institutions,<sup>5</sup> most of which concern sur-

<sup>4</sup>An International News Service item, from Washington, D.C., March 4, 1958, refers to a survey by the U.S. Office of Education showing that the average salary for college faculty members in the U.S. that year (1957-1958) was \$6,120.

<sup>5</sup>In addition to those discussed in the text, the following contain interesting information: General (pre-World War II): John H. McNeely, *College Student Mortality*, Publication 1937, No. 11, U.S. Office of Education, Washington, D.C., 1938 (a study of 15,535 freshmen who entered 25 colleges in the fall of college year 1931-1932).

Specific (post-World War II): Charles L. Koelsche, "A Study of the Student Drop-out Problems at Indiana University," *Journal of Educational Research*, XLIX (January, 1956): 357-364; L. J. Lins and Hy Pitt, "The Staying

vival-to-graduation of all freshmen and not just those taking subfreshman English courses.

An important recent study was Robert E. Iffert's *Retention and Withdrawal of College Students* (Bulletin 1958, No. 1, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, D.C., 1957), a study of 12,667 freshmen who entered in the fall of 1950, in 147 sampled institutions. The grand total of those graduated in four years was 39.5%; in publicly supported institutions 33% graduated in four years. In technological institutions 42.8% graduated in four years, with 13.3% still attending after four years, with very likely most of these—perhaps an additional 10%—eventually graduating (pp. 16, 18, 19).

Comparable results are found in *Four-Year Follow-Up Study of 1948 Freshman Entrants to Engineering Colleges*,<sup>6</sup> made in 1953 for the U.S. Coast Guard by Educational Testing Service. One hundred and one undergraduate engineering colleges furnished data for over 13,000 entrants in the fall of 1948. In four years 33% graduated from technological institutions or universities with colleges of engineering, or had completed satisfactorily four years of a five-year program; 11% were still enrolled and presumably graduated at the end of the fifth year—i.e., a total of 44% attained graduation, but, as might be expected, wide variations existed in graduation and withdrawal rates among institutions.

Purdue University is a technological institution and is publicly supported as

Power and Rate of Progress of University of Wisconsin Freshmen," *College and University*, XXIX (October, 1953): 86-99; Oscar H. Werner, *The Scholastic Persistence of 2,140 Unclassified Students in the University of Nebraska*, University of Nebraska Publication No. 189, Contribution to Education No. 31, Lincoln, Nebraska, 1955.

<sup>6</sup>Out of print. Summarized by A. Pemberton Johnson, "Graduation Hold-Back and Withdrawal Rates in Engineering Colleges," *Journal of Engineering Education*, 45 (November, 1954): 270-273.

the land-grant college of Indiana. Its record of graduates of ex-subfreshman English students, 36%, including of course those who needed more than four years, compares favorably with the results found in the two studies mentioned, as well as with studies made at specific institutions. One reason for the Purdue record may be that the 11-semester average was raised by the persistence-for-education of World War II veterans. Perhaps, also, agricultural, science, and engineering students (the great majority at Purdue) fix their sights on a specific vocation and are determined to achieve.

*Estimate of Value of Subfreshman English.* Purposely contradictory conclusions concerning the value of subfreshman English can be drawn, one favoring continuation of remedial English, one favoring abandonment. Those who argue for abandonment could do so on the ground that the percentage difference between remedial-English students who graduate and regular students who graduate is small, and almost the same percentage would have graduated if all students had taken the regular course, with the weaker ones repeating it as often as necessary. Those who argue for continuation do so on the ground that a fairly large percentage of remedial English students who graduate could not have done so without remedial-English instruction.<sup>7</sup> So far there have been no studies involving experimental and control groups to support either conclusion.

Aside from the evidence given above and lacking the evidence of a control group, other complicating factors have developed at Purdue. During part of the period of this study, there was a Writing Laboratory (begun 1951) to provide assistance for poorly prepared students not

<sup>7</sup>These contradictory conclusions are similar to and based upon the conclusions of a Washington State College Study: Bryson L. Jaynes, "Remedial English and College Graduation," *College Composition and Communication*, IX (February, 1958): 23-25.

assigned to remedial English but assigned to the regular course. In September, 1958, formal subfreshman English (i.e., English 1) was abolished, but all poorly prepared students were urged—in fact, virtually required, to attend Writing Laboratory two hours a week in addition to the regular three-hour class. With increasing numbers of students and with a shortage of teachers, even Writing Laboratory assistance was abandoned begin-

ning September, 1960, and all poorly prepared students in English now take their chances in the regular composition course, English 101. If and when extensive and thorough studies of the results of both these plans are made, the present study, "Results and Costs of Eleven Semesters of Subfreshman English Instruction," may well serve as a basis for comparison.

## Staff Room Interchange

### *In Defense of Freshman English*

Recently, at one of the workshop sessions of the four C's in Washington, D.C., the suggestion was made that the present course in Freshman English be dropped from the curriculum entirely in favor of courses in language and literature, for which teachers of English have been specially prepared. It was pointed out by these people that it is the duty of all teachers to teach students to write, that English teachers have not been specially prepared for this purpose, and that the present course, lacking content as it does, is accomplishing little or nothing. Not long after the conference, writing in *Harper Books and Authors*, Paul Roberts made much the same point. Though in all fairness I must say that Dr. Roberts is in favor of continued writing practice and careful grading and conference work, he does feel that other teachers, too, are qualified to assume this responsibility, that English teachers lack any special qualifications for it, and that the present course has achieved nothing "except the ruin of departments of English." It is my opinion that this view is too extreme and not wholly justified by the facts.

First of all, if by "no content" Dr. Roberts and the others mean that Freshman English is a skill-course and not a subject-matter one, they are, most certainly, right. But would any of us be willing to dismiss Freshman English on this ground alone? It seems to me that all courses, when properly taught, are skill-courses, even when they deal with such subjects as history and biology. What teacher of literature, for ex-

ample, would be satisfied with the students who knew all the facts contained in the novels and short stories, dramas and poems, and who knew all the critical evaluations made in their textbook and by their instructor, but who lacked entirely the ability to read with profit and critical understanding any work of literature not covered in the course? Or what teacher of language would be satisfied with the student who knew the facts concerning the history of the language and the various linguistic theories, but could not present a coherent, defensible theory of linguistics and linguistic change for himself?

In science, the greatness of Einstein was not in his mastery of the physical facts of the universe as presented to him in college; it was, rather, in his skill in making new discoveries and presenting new theories. Also, the genius of Dr. Salk of polio fame lay not in his mastery of the facts about polio, but in his skill in preparing an effective vaccine. In fact, the demarcation between a merely competent technician in science and a genuine scientist seems to lie wholly in this matter of skill to push beyond the barriers presented by the present state of knowledge. Some essayists, even, have gone so far as to say that the trouble with Nazi Germany was that it had plenty of technicians, but no one skilled in the art of being human.

Now who is better qualified to teach the art of being human than the teacher of the humanities? And what better way is there to teach this art than to get students to

write on subjects which most interest them and in which they are most likely to develop skills? If the general public believes that the teacher of English has special qualifications for teaching students to write, it is (surely) only because teachers of English are best qualified to recognize, because of their literary training, really effective prose. The biologist may know biology and the historian may know history, but not all teachers of these subjects know good writing when they see it. And, although this may be true of some English teachers as well, the difference lies in the fact that the biologist and historian are still qualified to teach their subjects, while the English teacher who can't tell good writing from bad most certainly is not. That is why there is a great deal of justification in the position that English teachers are best qualified to teach writing. And, by allowing students to write on any subject which interests the student, the wise English teacher realizes that he is helping the student to express *himself*, and not merely to plagiarize the work of others. To give specific literary or linguistic content to the course in Freshman English would, for most students, remove whatever motivation they might have for writing well.

I do not mean, of course, to say that it is no part of the Freshman English course to enlarge student horizons. This is usually done by the reading of carefully selected essays. All of us, however, have noticed that if we succeed in getting the student to relate the ideas of the essays to his own experience so that he becomes genuinely interested, he writes a much better theme than he does if he treats the subject of the essay abstractly as something foreign to him. And this is precisely why the course in Freshman English should *not* be a course in language or literature. Those who are interested will encounter these courses later on; some of them will be required to take courses in the history of the language and in literature before their educational experience is over. A freshman course in these subjects is, therefore, unnecessary, and, just as the advanced student who dislikes literature intensely will usually fail a required course in the subject, so would the freshman. If we change the course, we increase the chances of failure of a considerable number of students.

So much for the theoretical part of my argument. I was quite intrigued by the claim of Dr. Roberts and those at the workshop session of the conference that my

course in Freshman English was not really accomplishing anything worthwhile and that students wrote just as badly when they left the course as they did when they entered it. In order to see whether I had been wholly wrong in believing that I was doing something worthwhile in my teaching, I reviewed my grade record books for the past two years. I found that I had offered the course to 135 students in this time (exclusive of second semester students). I found that, of this number, 50 had raised their grade one-half letter or more from the first theme, written without instruction, to the final theme in the course. Most of these 50 students raised their grade one letter, and a few succeeded in raising it two letters. And all of this despite the fact that my grading standards were much, much higher on the final theme than they were on the first one! Naturally, like most English teachers, I incline toward perfectionism, and I will admit that this record is not spectacular. But it does, I think, pretty well show that the course in Freshman English, as it is presently constituted, does accomplish something.

Lest I be misunderstood, let me say that I do believe we need the cooperation of teachers in other departments if we are to achieve genuine success in Freshman English. Sloppy work should not be accepted by other departments, or students will soon fall back into the same slovenly habits we helped to free them from. But it is our duty primarily to teach the course—not theirs.

Following is the first theme I received from a student who made "B" in English 101 and "A" in English 102. I graded the theme "D-minus" in organization and content and "C-minus" in mechanics.

#### Why I Am Enrolled in College

How much formal education have you had? Is it enough? Why haven't you had more? What kind of job do you expect to secure without some college training? I am unhappy with my answers and I want to try to change them.

Self improvement is it the answer? Yes, but how. Why not try taking a couple evening classes at the College? I am! Would English help? It's mandatory. Why haven't I started sooner? I was afraid to find out how ignorant I really am. Why shouldn't I find out. I've waited long enough. Is a better job the only reason for self improvement? No wouldn't it be nice to look into a mirror and say, "I tried" I think so. For his term paper in English 102, this student chose to investigate the problem of the starlings which have been littering up our fair city. He did a competent, valuable job.

Do not such examples speak for themselves?

ROBERT P. SAALBACH

Indiana State College, Terre Haute

### *A Communications Sequence on the Graduate Level*

Most courses in communication which one comes across are taught in the undergraduate division, usually confined to the freshman and sophomore years. At Jersey City State College, however, we have been experimenting for the past year and a half with a communications sequence on the graduate level. As yet this graduate program is in its beginnings, and involves only elementary school teachers who study for a Master of Art's degree in Education. Part of their work outside of education includes content courses in the various disciplines. Many of these students have had only one year of undergraduate training in English. In some cases this work was taken many years ago, before such matters as semantics and mass communication had become important concerns in the freshman English course.

With this background in mind, we set up a sequence of four one-semester courses with communication as the basic unifying principle. The introductory course concentrates on semantics; next in order is an introduction to descriptive linguistics, followed by a study of the mass media of journalism, radio, the motion picture and television, with special attention to their impact on young children. Finally, there is

a study of selected works from contemporary literature, focusing on what each writer is trying to communicate and analyzing the means he employs. The basic principles emphasized in this sequence are much the same as in the freshman two-semester communications course taught in the undergraduate division of the college, but the attention paid to each of the four subjects is much more intensive, and the specific questions and problems are different in keeping with the greater maturity of the graduate students and their greater facility in communication.

Students are able to take the entire sequence and are encouraged to do so, but are also permitted to take one or more individual courses. Most of the students are practicing elementary school teachers and they have been very enthusiastic, not only about the intrinsic value of the sequence, but its usefulness in their own professional work with young children. To some of the older students who have been teaching for upwards of twenty years, the revelations, particularly in the semantics part of the sequence, have come as something of an emotional shock.

SANFORD RADNER  
Jersey City State College

### *The Novel As Primary Source in the Freshman Research Paper*

For the past two years I have departed from the conventional methods of teaching the research paper in Freshman English, first, because I felt the end results were skimpy in thought and overly mechanical in presentation, and, second, because I represented the criticism often made by members of other departments that the Freshman English staff was not entirely successful (to put it mildly) in conveying to the students what research writing really is. I decided, therefore, to see what could be done not primarily to initiate my students into the mechanics of writing the paper (which I call the "documented essay" in order to stress personal contribution) but rather to encourage them to read novels carefully and to write about them intelligently. For some time I had been cognizant of the fact that many students get preciously little out of the research project, chiefly, I think, because mechanics and form are stressed *before* their importance is actually felt. It also occurred to me that the work of an entire semester could too easily be made subservient to the ends of the research project

rather than making the project serve the broader objectives of the Freshman English course.

My first problem was to formulate an approach to the research project without seeming to do so, or at least without making a great fuss about it, because I wanted the students to arrive more or less independently at a point where they could appreciate the need and value of research. At the first class meeting I explained that while the documented essay was to be the major work of the semester it was by no means the only important assignment. On the same day I distributed a list of novels and assigned a 500-word book review to be submitted in four weeks. The novel selected by each student was to be the raw material, the primary source, for his documented essay, and it was to be known thoroughly. The book review was to consist mainly of a discussion of the central theme or themes of the novel, and an attempt was to be made to isolate and define a problem that might profitably be explored in a longer paper.

After devoting the second week to the

purpose and problems of research and to outlining, notetaking, footnotes, and bibliography, I dropped the subject of the documented essay until I returned the book reviews the sixth week, when I assigned, as the next step in the project, a statement of purpose. Thinking through this statement proved less difficult than it usually does because the students had already attempted to formulate investigative problems in their book reviews and because many of them had begun reading in secondary sources (though this had not been encouraged until the review had been written).

To stress individual contribution, I tried to get as many students as possible to select other novels by the authors they had chosen, requiring in such cases few secondary sources and, in some, none at all. It was an edifying experience to have some of my students elect to read four or five novels and, more important, to deal with them independently. For those electing to write on one novel, I required a minimum of six obviously relevant secondary sources to test the students' ability to be selective and to keep the idea of personal contribution uppermost in their minds.

During the eighth week the students presented oral progress reports, giving the class some idea of the types of problems being dealt with and of the various ways in which they were being solved. This proved to be a profitable exercise. Among other things it promoted a sense of unity since the entire class was working in one field of research and with related problems, and it was responsible for considerable competition because several students had selected the same novels to write about.

Outlines and note cards were due the ninth week. A close check of the note cards gave a reasonably good idea of how thoroughly the novels had been explored and of how heavily or lightly the papers would depend on secondary materials. Returning the outlines and note cards provided the last opportunity for commenting on the various approaches the students were taking, on their methods of organizing their papers, and on how well their note cards were co-ordinated with their outlines.

The fact that the short story and fiction in general had been our major concern during the first half of the semester proved to be a great help to the students. They could read their novels as they were enlarging their critical vocabulary, and before they wrote their documented essays they had a reasonably good command of such matters

as point of view, plotting, characterization, thesis, setting, tone, symbolism, and the like. In addition to discussing the assigned short stories in class, the students wrote prepared and impromptu essays on various aspects of fiction and a series of exercises dealing with fairly specialized problems in most of the fourteen short stories they were required to read.

The value of attempting to interrelate the research project and other course content and assignments cannot be minimized. Through studying the short story the students developed critical skills they could put to use and sharpen in writing their documented essays. When they sat down to write their long papers, they were not approaching something with which they were entirely unfamiliar. For the most part, they knew their novels well and consequently did not have to accept uncritically the evaluations of the commentators they had come upon in their research. For many of the students the course became increasingly more meaningful and purposeful week by week, simply because one thing led naturally to another. Most of them did not, as far as I could ascertain, experience the frustration and mental anguish so common among those writing the first research paper.

Not all of the papers were distinguished, it is true, but nearly all of them showed some attempt to come to grips with problems in the novels themselves. The topics, developed independently by the students, ranged from the indefinite ("Joseph Conrad," "The Red Badge of Courage") to the particularized ("The Role of Personal Conflict in the Art of James Joyce," "Dostoevski Vs. The Grand Inquisitor," "A Study of Conrad's *Lord Jim* with Integrated Emphasis on Particular Characters and Literary Techniques"), from the inquisitive ("What Is *Main Street*?" "Graham Greene: Heaven or Hell?" "Eustacia Vye and Tess Durbeyfield: Tragedies of Fate or Character?") to the affirmative ("Steinbeck and Biology," "The Remarkable Similarity Between *Vile Bodies* and *Black Mischief* and the Transition in *Brideshead Revisited*"). Other topics will suggest the variety of investigation: "A Study in Gray: Sinclair Lewis's Picture of American Society in the 1920's," "The Mirror of the Mind: Virginia Woolf and the Stream of Consciousness," "Sister Carrie: Tragedy of the American Dream," "Brave New World Vs. 1984: A Theme of Political and Social Investigation," "A Threefold Study of Somerset Maugham: Religion, Love, and Art," "The Ordeal of

Evelyn Waugh," "The Reality of Faulkner," "The Parallelisms in Three Novels by Hemingway," "The Use of Symbolism and the Pattern of Sin in *The Scarlet Letter*," "Tolstoy's Great Humanitarian Novel," "The Physical World of Hemingway," "Satire and Religion in Waugh's Works."

When asked, late in the semester, to write their opinions on the value of the research project, the students responded quite favorably, if not always enthusiastically. The following comments are representative: "I think the research project was profitable, if only because it got me to read more of Hemingway than I had before." "Yes, I do think that the research project was a profitable exercise. In choosing our own themes, our own novels, and our own approach, I think we learned the value of selectivity. We did gain knowledge." "I feel that the research project was very profitable in that it showed me the complexities of the novel. It made me really appreciate the work a writer puts into a novel. It was an excellent exercise to show the need for organization and preparation." "I think the research project was valuable because it gave us a chance to look a little deeper into the novel than we have done in the past. Naturally, we made mistakes, but all in all I'd say the project helped develop our writing ability as well as appealing to our interest. I, for one, really enjoyed it." "I think that through a project like this one can really learn something about a novelist." "I think the research project was very profitable, and I am very happy that it was assigned. I got to know two authors very well and plan to do more of this type of research on my own during the summer months." "I definitely think the research project was profitable. I would heartily endorse it above all other types of English research projects."

Only one student expressed an adverse opinion on the novel as the topic area. Typical of the response to the type of research assigned are the following observations: "I prefer free selection within a topic area like the novel." "Topic area of novel is good."

"Definitely yes." "I think the research project should be concerned with the novel because of its vast and varied influence." "I think the novel was a good topic and gave us a chance to read and form opinions of our own." "I prefer the type of selection we used to unrestricted selection because too often in unrestricted selection broad, general topics are chosen." "The choice of the student is easier to make if a topic area has been selected by the instructor. This will enable him to write a more thorough paper, and it will be more interesting to him."

Asked whether the oral progress report was helpful, a large majority of the students responded affirmatively. "Very helpful. Should be continued." "Yes, mainly because it gave me some idea of where to go in developing my paper." "The reports helped to clear up many problems." "It helped us decide on a definite rather than general theme." "From other people's research, ideas can be formed and enlarged upon, that one might not have thought of." "Yes, because through it we could use your and others' criticisms." "It gave the opportunity to get a basic idea of what our plans sounded like before placing them on paper." "This was very helpful because common problems were aired." "Many mistakes were avoided. It gave us some idea of what the instructor expected and made it easier to unify the paper." "It helped to establish our exact goal."

The value of this sort of research project is at least threefold. First, it gives the student the opportunity to work with interesting and sometimes provocative material. Second, it encourages independent exploration and evaluation by requiring the student to confront primary sources and to develop his own topic from them. Third, it promotes in the class as a whole a sense of unity and direction, something all too often missing in sections where the mechanics of research are the chief concern and where no topic area is assigned.

THOMAS C. KISHLER  
St. Norbert College

### *The OED in the Classroom*

Everyone speaks well of the *Oxford English Dictionary*. It is as universally admired by English teachers as any book since the Folio of 1623. Rarely does the freshman complete his pilgrimage through freshman composition without hearing some teacher extol Messrs. Murray, Bradley, Craigie and Onions and their ten-volume offspring.

Whether freshman composition be the broad highway to him or the slough of despond, he is dimly aware that one of the guardian angels along the route is an awesome and benevolent monster named *OED* (alias *NED*).

Why then is the *Oxford English Dictionary* only talked about in English composi-

tion and seldom really used? Certainly the teacher knows that *OED* is not as unapproachable as he first appears. He can be quite companionable. And certainly one objective of this course is to give the student a feeling for diction, an historical perspective on words and the cultural values they embody. I believe the teacher's reluctance often originates in an unpleasant experience with the wrong kind of *OED* assignment. If a teacher tells thirty (or even worse, sixty or ninety) freshmen "Look up the word *harness* in the *OED* and write a theme on the historical development of the word," the results are bound to be disappointing. Such an assignment may have a place in a course in the history of the language. It will not work in freshman composition, for several reasons.

First is the problem of cheating. Our students are well schooled in getting along with people, and their cooperative endeavors often take the form of delegating one of their number to go to the library and dig out the data for all of them. Second, the librarians complain, and with good reason, for thirty (or sixty or ninety) freshmen simultaneously descending on one poor page of the same reference book can wreak unbelievable wear and tear. I was told of one large English department which wrote such an assignment into its syllabus for use in all sections of the freshman course. After just one semester the relevant page was literally worn out. This department subsequently dropped *OED* assignments from its syllabus entirely, though presumably the teachers still extol the work as a lexicographical monument and the eighth unnatural wonder of the world.

Far more basic is the objection that such assignments just don't seem to fit in with the rest of the course. Teachers who are almost diametrically opposed on what the rest of the course should be agree on this point. Most freshmen lack the linguistic background to recognize an historical process in the word *harness*, unless it is explained to them in advance, and are likely to bring in an irrelevant garland of variant spellings, with a conclusion that "This word has changed quite a lot." If the point of the assignment is fully explained in advance, then the student has only the busy work of copying down the data. Faced with this dilemma, the teacher concludes that this assignment contributes little to the student's ability to read and understand, to think creatively, and to express his own ideas. He questions whether the student

even has any more feeling for the word *harness*. He decides that the time can better be spent in reading one more essay or even in writing one more theme on "How to Solve the Campus Parking Problem."

I have developed a new approach to the classroom use of the *OED*, one for which I cannot claim complete success but which avoids most of these difficulties. It has two other advantages: it introduces the student to other dictionaries besides the *OED*, and by presenting each student with an individual problem to solve by inductive reasoning, it makes dictionary study more of a philosophical discipline, as all linguistics should be.

In this approach, the teacher first describes the scope, the format, and the use of the following four dictionaries: *The Oxford English Dictionary*, *A Dictionary of American English*, *Webster's New International Dictionary* (second edition, unabridged), and *Partridge's Dictionary of Slang and Unconventional English*. He then explains various directions which the historical development of meaning may take. These would presumably include extension (e.g., *curfew*), restriction (e.g. *adventure*, *deer*), pejoration (e.g., *propaganda*), amelioration (e.g., *chapel*, *chaplain*), folk etymology (e.g., *belfry*, *cockroach*), and that strange amoeba-like splitting of one word into two which we find in such doublets as *grammar-glamour*, *antic-antique*, *camera-chamber*. This explanation is necessary to give the student some vocabulary to handle the abstractions with which he will be dealing.

Each student is then given a different individual assignment, consisting of five words. He is told only that his five words all illustrate one general principle of historical development. He is to formulate this principle inductively and demonstrate how the five word histories he has compiled are instances of it. For example, he may be assigned *zest*, *dog*, *paper*, *lynch*, *boycott*. He must read the entries for these five words in the four dictionaries recommended. He must search for the relevant amid a bewildering mass of information irrelevant to his problem. He must formulate the hypothesis that these words all illustrate semantic extension. Finally he must show how *zest* has been extended from the early sense of a twist of lemon peel, *boycott* from a man's name, and so on.

The following twenty sample assignments will suggest the range possible.

1. *zest*, *dog*, *paper*, *lynch*, *boycott*
2. *czar*, *meander*, *bonfire*, *frock*, *fee*

3. thing, virtue, place, religious, pain
4. layman, conduct (noun), sail (verb), assassin, scene
5. corn, starve, wade, disease, meat
6. fowl, undertaker, doctor, hound, wealth
7. stink (verb), cattle, diaper, sell, estate
8. liquor, affection, mansion, fable, hint
9. villain, crafty, idiot, hussy, silly
10. counterfeit, knave, appeasement, stink (verb), gossip
11. boor, wench, fanatic, lust, lewd
12. marshal, minister, nice, lord, lady, knight
13. sirloin, Welsh rarebit, hiccough, rhyme, perfect
14. beggar, cutlass, shamefaced, penthouse, crayfish
15. touchy, artichoke, walnut, pantry, buttery (noun)
16. darn, danged, gosh, golly, geewhiz, heck
17. guest, host, hostile, hospitality, hospital, hostel, hotel
18. major, mayor, card, chart, dike, ditch
19. scatter, shatter, skirt, shirt, scuffle, shuffle
20. regal, royal, real, legal, loyal, leal

Assignments 1-4, of course, illustrate extension, 5-8 restriction, 9-11 pejoration, 12 amelioration, 13-15 folk etymology, 16 euphemism by phonetic distortion, and 17-20 doublets. The teacher will modify or add to this list to suit himself. I have used this approach nine times, never twice with exactly the same list.

The student may present his report either orally or as a written theme. Five-minute oral reports, though time-consuming, allow the student to share his discoveries with his colleagues. Because of his inductive approach, the student has indeed made a discovery and he is proud of it. Stimulating discussions develop, which the teacher may direct toward the problems in reading that last essay by Bacon or toward the imprecise diction in last week's themes.

How does the student react to the assignment? I can hardly claim that every freshman develops a profound love of words and a reliable sense of right diction in his writing. This must come with maturity and experience. However, he at least loses much of his semantic naiveté, his facile assumption that word X equals thing Y. He knows the importance of the date of any text he may read. If he is later puzzled at reading about "eyes watery with rheumatism," he is aware that his understanding of the word *rheumatism* is somehow incomplete. And he knows where to go for an answer. He may not make daily pilgrimages to the *OED* for the rest of his life, but he knows that it is there and what it is for.

The *OED* has too long been glibly praised as a "monument of modern philosophy." Monuments are cold and lifeless and suggest statues in the park, of little use to anyone except birds and climbing children. No freshman is going to trek a hundred yards from the union building to the library just to view a monument. If the *OED* is not presented to the student as a route toward understanding his vocabulary and hence understanding his cultural heritage and himself, it will adorn its library shelf until doomsday, impressive, monumental, disturbed only occasionally by some research-minded professor.

DAVID DECAMP  
University of Texas

## A Freshman Heresy: Revise Equals Recopy

DAVID D. COTE and LAWRENCE A. RUFF<sup>1</sup>

This article is written with an eye to alleviating what at times may be a perplexing problem for the bloodshot, the weary-eyed Freshman Composition Instructor. How does one communicate to the Freshman student the difference between theme revision and theme recopying?

Usually, after the first theme has been corrected it is returned criss-crossed with lines and arrows, liberally bespattered with terse (perhaps cruel) comments, and nigh illegible under a net of

admonitory prose. But, we think, this is the *first* theme; let us not despair! After all, have we not pointed out to the student the error of his childish, prattling ways and is not improvement at hand? We then announce revision is required.

What is revision? The Freshman, bless his mimetic soul, too often thinks it a slavish imitation entailing the acceptance of his professor's charitable suggestions and comments, the reproduction of an essentially unchanged theme,

or, God help up, the exclusion of a rather untidy paragraph that has been mercilessly slashed. He labors—or not, as the case may be—under the delusion that “revise” and “recopy” are synonymous, and he submits—under the misleading heading “Revision”—a paper which incorporates only the most obvious corrections, blandly ignores the more intricate comments, and, at times, cravenly evades all difficulty by neglecting to analyze the professor’s critical evaluation.

In short, since such misguided attempts at revision succeed only in wasting the student’s time, and since we do not want him to recopy his themes but do want him to effect an essential improvement, perhaps an exercise in the distinctions between revising and recopying would be helpful. With this in mind, the following comparisons are made:

#### *Revision*

1. Is not recopying and merely including professorial corrections of spelling, punctuation, etc.
2. Is not omission of paragraphs or sections considered inadequate (such as those heavily red-penciled or labeled “awkward,” “trite,” “stilted,” etc.).
3. Is not partial theme improvement.
4. Is not satisfactory when critical comments on the theme as a whole are ignored.
5. Is not satisfactory when the revised theme is less adequate than the original.
1. Is careful revaluation of each sentence with particular attention to improvement of vocabulary, diction, spelling, structure, etc.
2. Is consideration of any possible methods of improving inadequately written paragraphs or sections.
3. Is improvement of all poorly constructed sections.
4. Is satisfactory when the student complies with general suggestions aimed at the development of clear, precise, accurate, interesting prose.
5. Is satisfactory when the revised theme is indicative of a careful, conscientious attempt toward improvement.

It is hoped, moreover, that proper analysis of the following exercise (application of the above principles to the sample revisions printed below) will make clear to the student what does and what does not constitute adequate theme revision. The exercise, of course, is somewhat idealistic. Time does not allow the professor to scrutinize every Freshman theme to the degree achieved in this paper. Nor will the student’s revision be so successful as the example printed here. Yet, the student should be shown what adequate revision is. He may not be able to attain it but at least he will be able to make a conscious, guided and sincere attempt to do so. And since the exercise has been used successfully in the authors’ classes, perhaps we will not be amiss in offering it to our colleagues as a means of eliminating the Freshman heresy that “revise equals recopy.” (See p. 231.)

#### *The Theme Adequately Revised*

(Note the general thematic improvement in this revision: Poorly constructed paragraphs and sections have been rewritten. A necessary extra paragraph has been added. Suggestions and criticisms have been carefully followed.)

#### *Two Novels I Have Liked*

Two novels that especially appeal to my literary taste are Charlotte Bronte’s *Jane Eyre* and Annemarie Selinko’s *Desirée*. *Jane Eyre* may be called autobiographical because it was based on many of Charlotte Bronte’s personal experiences. More important, however, the novel was a pioneer in its field because it was realistic in tone and because it modified that attitude toward romantic love. Prior to Miss Bronte’s novel, romantic tales usually depicted beautiful women being rescued from fantastic situations by knights on white stallions. *Jane Eyre*, however, is not a beautiful woman, but she is deeply loved for her sincerity and beauty of mind.

*Desirée* was as light and fanciful as *Jane Eyre* was somber and thought-provoking. Even though it is hard to believe that *Desirée* played as important a role in the life of Napoleon and the history of France as the novel suggests, the story is told in such

## THE ORIGINAL THEME (CORRECTED AND RETURNED TO THE STUDENT)

Two Novels I Have Liked

Two novels that especially appeal to my literary taste are Jane Eyre and Désirée. Jane Eyre was written by Bronte and could be called a biography of her life. It is realistic and a pioneer in the field of the novel and it introduced romantic love. Before this novel was written by Bronte novels were full of beautiful women being rescued by knights on white stallions. Jane Eyre is not a beautiful woman but she is deeply loved for her sincerity and beauty of mind. Désirée was as light and fanciful as Jane Eyre. Jane Eyre was sober and full of thought-provoking passages. Even though it is hard to believe that this woman played as important a role in the life of Napolian and the history of France as the novel states. The story is told in such an (before a vowel) enchanting way that you want to believe it and do. The book probably would appeal to the sentimental person because of its love and emotional aspects. My favorite scene in Désirée occurs when Desirée goes to Thérèse Tallien's house and sees Napolian there with Josephine and Thérèse, who he later marries and who is wearing a red ribbon around her neck to show she got away from the guillotine, and she throws champagne all over her dress. It is in this scene that Désirée meets her future husband.

I liked Jane Eyre and Désirée very much but in an entirely different manner. Jane Eyre appeals to the more

serious and realistic side of life while Désirée is more false implication — no fairy tales in Désirée full of fantastic dreams and fairy tales. Désirée right word? probably never will be called equal to Jane Eyre but I believe it was well written. The authors made me cry and laugh when the heroes and heroines experienced victory and defeat. I felt as if I had lived with them and, to me, that means the author has written and accomplished the goal of every author--to make his book live in the mind of its readers. Comment: Your paper expresses some very good thoughts throughout but lacks effectiveness because:

- 1) Spelling, punctuation, and general mechanics must be improved.
- 2) Your first paragraph would be better as two; i.e., discuss Jane Eyre, then Désirée, then both together.
- 3) Your second paragraph (in the theme as it now stands) is extremely disordered and confusing and needs complete reworking.

#### THE THEME INADEQUATELY REVISED

##### Two Novels I Have Liked

Two novels that especially appeal to my literary taste are Jane Eyre and Désirée. Jane Eyre was written by Charlotte Bronte and could be called a biography. It is realistic and a pioneer in the field of the novel and it introduced romantic love. Before this novel was written by Charlotte Bronte, most novels were full of beautiful women being rescued from things by knights on white stallions. Jane Eyre is not a beautiful woman but she is deeply loved for her sincerity and beauty of mind.

Désirée was as light and fanciful as Jane Eyre was somber and full of thought-provoking passages. Even though it is hard to believe that Désirée played as important a

role in the life of Napoleon and the history of France as  
 weak, unemphatic verb  
 the novel says, the story is told in such an enchanting way  
 that you want to believe it and do. The book probably would  
 appeal to the sentimental person because of its love and  
 emotional aspects. <sup>no revision</sup> Original unsatisfactory  
paragraph omitted

I liked Jane Eyre and Désirée very much but <sup>in an</sup> no revision  
 entirely different manner. Jane Eyre appeals to the more  
 serious and realistic side of life while Désirée is more  
 full of fantastic dreams. Désirée probably never will be  
 considered equal to Jane Eyre, but I believe it was well  
 written. The authors made me cry and laugh when the heroes  
 and heroines experienced victory and defeat. I felt as if  
<sup>no revision</sup> I had lived with them and, to me, that means the author has  
 accomplished his goal--to make his book live in the minds of  
 its readers.

an enchanting way that the reader wants to believe it and does. The book probably would appeal to the sentimental person because it emphasizes the romantic and the emotional aspects of life.

My favorite scene in *Desiree* is that in which Désirée goes to Therese Tallien's house and meets, upon entering, her future husband General Bernadotte. Inside, she discovers Napoleon with Therese and Josephine. Josephine is beautifully dressed and is wearing a red ribbon around her neck, signifying her escape from the guillotine. When she learns that Napoleon is to marry Josephine, Désirée throws champagne over the future empress' dress.

In *Jane Eyre* my favorite scene depicts Jane finally discovering the true cause for the uneasy, brooding atmosphere of Thornfield, Rochester's home, and for Rochester's temperamental character. Throughout the book there have been indications that something is wrong; Jane has been terrified by weird noises and confusion in the house at night. Then, when she and Rochester are about to marry, a man appears and states

that he is the brother of Rochester's wife. Jane is shocked and unbelieving, but the man is telling the truth. In the attic of Thornfield, Rochester shows Jane his wife—a terrible, animal-like creature who is hopelessly insane and morally corrupt. Rochester had been tricked into marrying her and had concealed her because of shame and loathing. At the end of the scene, Jane believes she has lost Rochester and cries in her heart, "Farewell! Farewell for ever!"

It should be clear that I liked *Jane Eyre* and *Desiree* very much, but for entirely different reasons. *Jane Eyre* appealed to my serious and realistic sense, while *Desiree* satisfied my hunger for romance. *Desiree* probably never will be considered equal to *Jane Eyre*, but I believe it was well written. The authors made me laugh or cry when the heroes and heroines experienced victory or defeat. I felt as if I had lived with the characters and, to me, that means the author has accomplished his goal—to make his book live in the minds of its readers.

# How Do You Grade A Composition

HERMAN A. ESTRIN<sup>1</sup>

"How do you grade a composition?  
Describe your process."

English instructors have been plagued by this question. To find a consensus, the author wrote the Department of English in one hundred colleges and universities. Eighty of them responded.

The following are instructors' descriptions of the theme-correcting processes:

Read first for content, clarity, ideas. Paragraph analysis occurs almost simultaneously. Mechanics are then evaluated. Frequently I read for only one or two items—variety in sentence construction, effective use of transitions, etc.

All our compositions deal with the subject matter of our courses: in the grammar section of our course, students write about grammatical problems (we devise problems for these papers). Papers are graded on two counts: knowledge of the subject matter and compositional excellence. If they are deficient on either count, we penalize them, quite as we assume they are penalized in any other course in the university. (Our assumption is slowly but surely gaining ground, as our colleagues are growing aware that we in the English Department do not assume responsibility for the English of the student body.)

I read papers slowly, noting problems, calling attention to errors, sometimes suggesting alternate expressions, idioms, etc. Then I spread the paper out on my desk so that I can see the whole thing at once. I read it again, noting corrections needed to bring the paper up to standard. Finally I glance at all of the annotations, rate their number and seriousness, and then decide on a grade.

I am sure each individual has his own method. In general, members of the department look for errors in spelling, punctuation, grammar, mechanics; after indicating these (or possibly while indicating these) members evaluate the rhetoric and the content.

Grammar, mechanics, and coherence are considered minimum requirements for acceptable work. Emphasis is on content, subject matter, limitation of assigned topic,

significant thought, and precision of expression.

It is impossible to generalize for an entire department since each teacher has his own methods. Organization, diction, coherence as well as grammar, however, are usually emphasized.

We use a standardized set of marking symbols throughout the four semesters and begin by marking sentence errors, spelling, major grammatical violations, major punctuation errors, and faulty diction. Then we move to rhetorical matters—coherence, unity, emphasis in sentences and paragraphs and, finally, to compositions. The students do almost all their writing in class on subjects related to grammar, language, and the writing process. We grade, then, on content too.

(1) Read it one or more times and comment in the margins and the text on anything that occurs to us. (2) Write a comment on the outside. (3) Put a letter on it. Some of our people use numbers. I don't think it matters much as long as there is a clear understanding between the student and his teacher about the general value of the grade. We make no pretense of scientific objectivity, but in general a C (or 75) theme is a paragon of negative virtues reasonably clear and correct but not particularly well written or interesting.

We evaluate both the content and the mechanics. At the end of the paper the student receives a written comment on the content and style, indicating both the virtues and faults of the paper and pointing out how he might improve his paper for the following week.

I read it with a careful eye for simple errors (spelling, grammar, syntax) and note these. Then I reread the paper for its ideas, organization, and that nebulous element called style.

Our instructors in freshman English mark all errors in grammar, syntax, and rhetoric. They refer the student to the appropriate sections in the text. The student either makes his corrections on the theme or rewrites the entire composition, according to the instructor's directions. The instructor also writes a critical evaluation of the composition for the benefit of the student.

We mark all errors in spelling, punctu-

<sup>1</sup>Newark College of Engineering.

ation, and grammar. More important we comment extensively on purpose, plan, thinking, organization. We try to offer a clear basis for student revision.

We have a list of unforgivable errors and fail any paper containing two or more. Beyond that, the instructor uses his judgment—we use letter grades—A, B, C, D, F.

(1) Give it a general reading to gain an impression of organization and general "feel." (2) Reread, marking the grammatical errors. (3) Reread, marking the organizational errors and making comments suggesting areas of improvement. (4) Put on a percentage grade.

We do not concentrate on specific errors alone. The central idea, its development, and organization are stressed. Positive, rather than negative, criticism is recommended in our course syllabi.

I read the paper once, marking all mechanical, some rhetorical, and most organizational errors. I then write a short note about the paper as a whole; finally I give the paper the grade I feel it deserves. I have no formula or mechanical standard for grading.

Initial reading to find the drift of thought and to select one or two matters for emphasis in criticism. Re-reading: Not all errors noted, simply those chosen for emphasis; some rewriting (a sentence here and there) for the student; quick praise for good management, a turn of phrase, an insight.

We mark compositions for everything, with special emphasis upon total organization, paragraphing, and sentence structure. Most of our students do not have serious difficulties with grammar.

With reference to the assigned or approved idea and its exposition, matters of mechanics and grammar are usually subordinated to the larger questions of organization, development, and effectiveness. Students whose writing is deficient mechanically or grammatically are remanded to English A, (the remedial course described above).

To be meritorious, a theme must give evidence of organization, i.e., clear arrangement and orderly progression of thought; it must disclose logical reasoning by making assertions convincing to a reader who

will not be impressed by the mere repetition of time-honored generalities; it must show correctness in mechanics, for example, in spelling and grammar; it must be acceptable in style by virtue of fluency of expression, freshness and precision in choice of words, and variety in sentence structure.

The consensus is that those who grade themes use the following criteria:

1. It must show correctness in mechanics in spelling, grammar, and punctuation.
2. It must give evidence of organization and logical reasoning. It should show clear arrangement and orderly progression of thought.
3. It must have content. The student must have something to say.
4. It must have maturity of style—a variety of sentence structure, exactness of language, precision in choice of words, and fluency of expression.

In correcting themes, the following are stressed in descending order.

1. Sentence structure
2. Paragraphing and paragraph development
3. Logical organization and outlining
4. Content
5. Spelling
6. Punctuation
7. Capitalization
8. Diction
9. Idiom
10. Originality and vigor

Significantly, two respondents stated the following:

Papers deviating from collegiate norms in these respects are marked down. We try to keep our emphasis on the structure of the paper, on paragraphing, and on sentence structure. I suspect that our colleagues in other departments are rather fussier about spelling than we. Papers clearly sub-standard in mechanics are failed without hesitation.

Gross errors such as comma splices and fused sentences will almost automatically fail a paper.

# Is English Composition Only for Americans?

ROBERT D. STEVICK<sup>1</sup>

Faith in college composition and communication teaching, I suppose, like any other faith these days is one which honest doubt may keep. The faith of English composition teachers in their professional activities is frequently questioned, whether by evaluation committees, by constant reports of new methods and motives, or by disappointing performances in the classroom. Reaction takes the form of still one more attempt to revise and improve one's practice—to make one's works more worthy. When, occasionally, despair overcomes one of our members and he doubts altogether the efficacy of our faith—he would throw over all attempts to teach composition and communication skills in college—then we may shudder a bit at this disquieting aberration, pity him as a sick soul, and quickly close the ranks of the faithful.

This total doubt is unquestionably the more difficult to assimilate or cast aside. It is being voiced increasingly by men of authority and is weighted with moral, academic, and economic data undeniably true and distressingly relevant. With demonstrations of diffuse and ineffectual Freshman English programs, of experiments in more rigorous high school teaching, and of devastating deductions from shortcomings of the upperclass students and college graduates, the proposals to abolish Freshman English, or to transform it radically,<sup>2</sup> give reason for some hard, honest doubt throughout the ranks of the faithful.

<sup>1</sup>University College of the West Indies, Jamaica.

<sup>2</sup>A convenient example is the pair of articles in *College English*; XXI (April 1960): Warner G. Rice offers "A Proposal for the Abolition of Freshman English, as It Is Now Commonly Taught, from the College Curriculum," and Albert R. Kitzhaber asks "Death—Or Transfiguration?"

I should like to add to that doubt, but only to purify the faith. Both intentions are served by first-hand experiences encountered in changing from college systems where composition programs are ubiquitous to a system where they have never existed. These experiences suggest that it may be possible to test our faith without the rigors of fasting, which resignations (or technological unemployment) would impose on the doubters and their innocent dependents.

The University College of the West Indies functions in a scheme of Special Relationship of the University of London. Under this scheme, students of the College prepare for degrees of the University of London. The College collaborates with the University in setting syllabuses and schemes of examinations, and the examiners are drawn from the College as well as from the University, but the University in all cases makes the final decision. The standard of performances required of students from the College is equal to that demanded from all other students of the University. The minimum period of study for a degree is three years. "The UCWI," as one experienced staff member sums it up, "is British."

The three-year degree program is achieved by having each student concentrate on his major subject field, with one or two "subsidiary" subjects; he begins with these studies immediately upon entering the College, and never pauses for the equivalent of a year and a half of "general education," including English composition: these background and special courses do not exist.

I have been referring to "the composition program." To test compulsory English composition by comparison with

conditions in the UCWI it is of course impossible to deal with *the* composition course: the total constituents of this variable entity, with its endless permutations and combinations in which the constituents merge in individual courses, are uninstructive to the degree that they are unwieldy. Some categories of the elements of college composition can be separated, nevertheless, and our test must deal with these more specific factors rather than with the impalpable whole of college composition.

*What difference does it make when an aspect of English composition is not the subject of formal college instruction?* When correct spelling is not taught yet is expected, students use their dictionaries and spell correctly. Punctuation is clear and conventional, though not as rigidly systematic, not as dependent on fixed rules of grammar, as American handbooks prescribe; this is a difference between British and American practice. A rebuke or a silent correction in essays keeps the student's attention on using punctuation as part of his mode of expression, rather than on a system of marks superimposed on word-groups consistent with grammatical rules. Grammatical problems are treated as problems in conventions of a standard dialect, whose particular idioms require mastery if one is to use the established language of instruction. Those deficient in these basic aspects of written English never enter the College: they are eliminated by Selection Boards, not by English Departments. Students seem to learn the standards of spelling, punctuation, and grammar quite as readily without special instruction as with it. If they lack strict rule-book accuracy, their communication skills are not thereby impaired.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>3</sup>I cannot forebear pointing out in this connection the similarity between conditions obtaining by tradition in the UCWI and those deliberately imposed at Fresno State College, on whose program I reported in the December 1960 issue of CCC; the conditions and the results have a striking congruity.

Another staple segment of composition instruction concerns footnote form and use, note cards, reference sources, and other materials and techniques connected with the perennial "research paper." Again, where there is no special course to teach these matters, students manage to learn them anyway. As the need arises a student will ask his teacher—or a more experienced fellow-student—which form of footnotes to use or what reference sources will lead him to publications in a stipulated subject field. These normal, intelligent questions originate in the student himself, and his learning is the more effective for that reason. These questions, it may be added, are not part of the equipment every student brings with him to the College: they are the responses to specific needs arising out of the normal demands of his subject-matter pursuits.

But what about plagiarism? What about the myriad devices of cunning for cheating, shirking, and being in general academically immoral? Without the exhortations of textbook and teacher and the lengthy ritual of exercises in preventive penance, how are students to learn that a typescript of someone else's writing is not a suitable essay under his name? The practical answer is—simple rejection of the essay by the teacher. To which the common response is to submit another essay, this time of an acceptable nature.

To the question, then, of what difference it makes when students do not receive separate instruction in the mechanics of standard written English, the methods and techniques of research and documentation, or the ethics of using written resources, the answer seems to be that it makes very little difference indeed, in the long run. Doubts of our faith may be seriously in order.

But does it make a difference if the student is not instructed in "The Paragraph—The Sentence—The Word," or if

he does not have tuition in the broad rhetorical types of definition, classification, inference, sufficiency of evidence, and the like? The answer here is that it seems to make considerable difference. As the student moves step by step through a subject-matter field, writing successive essays on one aspect or another of his study, he does not regularly learn to handle his information in orderly, precise, and lucid ways. As a matter of fact, the measure of student success in developing independently the requisite skills in mechanics, in research, and in ethical awareness is nearly matched by his helplessness in developing the rhetorical skills of order, emphasis, precision, and economy, in whatever expository form he may employ.

If it appears now that rhetorical skills do not develop efficiently when the student has not had special training in them, we still need to be sure, if our faith is to be justified, that it is our teaching that in fact produces those skills when they appear. My experiences seem to show that the rhetorical skills are teachable. It will be necessary at this point to describe some particulars within those broader observations just described.

Having taught college composition regularly for several years, in a variety of forms, locations, levels, and circumstances, and having devoted enough consideration to the problems of composition instruction to do a textbook or two, my move to a college in which there was no composition course held a prospect not unlike that of entering the heavenly city. The mundane realities of composition returned, however, through the week-by-week attempt to get the best possible results from students in their subject fields. For instance, in one essay a student omitted a crucial part of the history of English language borrowings from French, because he had not understood classification properly. Another

essay wandered mostly outside the subject of factors contributing to the development of a Standard English dialect because Standard English was never defined, even implicitly. A weird and wonderful account of the historical development of English noun inflections was submitted when the rules of inference were neglected in working with generally true data. And some amazing historical generalizations were formulated in another essay, whose writer blithely disregarded rules of evidence. Not only in essays, but in paragraph structure, sentence structure, and word choice, frequent awkward, inadequate, or incomprehensible utterances occurred.

Now, to get the historical descriptions and analyses of the English language right, it was necessary, in effect, to explain in that context the traditional rhetorical categories, the elements of structure of expression, and the common modes of logic. It was necessary, in short, to teach one segment of the composition course. The final test came, though, when the degree examinations (not term-examinations) were written. Students had been under no obligation to revise and resubmit essays, or, for that matter, to pay any attention to comments on their essays or other remarks on matters shared by the subject of composition. Some paid attention, some did not. Those who did, and especially those who frequently rewrote essays (other things being equal), wrote complete, accurate, and relevant answers on their examination papers. Those who did not, did not.

It appears, then, if this test case is not too exotic,<sup>4</sup> that the mechanics of gram-

<sup>4</sup>College education in the West Indies is not easily accessible, for economic and geographic reasons; because most students compete for a limited number of scholarships the standard of selection is high, relative to numbers of students of college age. On the other hand, students have had to learn standard English as the language of instruction, which differs markedly from a creole language (based on English) which most of them have as native

mar, punctuation, and spelling, the techniques and methods of research, and the ethics of writing fall into one category: while they may be taught at the college level by formal instruction they may be learned without it. Rhetorical and related skills fall into another: they can be taught by formal instruction at the college level and are not easily learned without explicit instruction. These latter skills can hardly be learned, exercised, or developed in the discontinuous bits of an exercise book; they seem rather to grow best in the context of maturity and detailed knowledge, and where concepts are relatively complex.

Thus a final question asks whether

speech; this fact tends to compensate for the higher standards of selection, if we wish to consider this case as a fair sample for testing the validity of compulsory English composition in American colleges.

these skills are best cultivated in the courses now established for composition training, or in the subject-matter courses (implying the discontinuance of freshman composition, unless it is to become merely a remedial course). To this question my experiences provide no answer. Reasoning suggests that a student will learn the matter and methods of his subject field more efficiently if he enters that field equipped to formulate his knowledge skillfully—i.e., if he has learned his basic rhetoric. Learning those skills is part of his general education, a part which, more than other parts, deserves priority in the college years. It would seem that our faith in college composition is triumphantly vindicated—but only when confined to its necessary and appropriate function. Ours is still a faith which honest doubt may keep.

## Mass Education and the Development of Skills

HOWARD O. BROGAN<sup>1</sup>

Whether we like the prospect or not, mass education is going to dominate the future of our colleges and universities far more than it has ever done in the past. We have all been frightened by the statistics on prospective enrollment of students as contrasted with prospective supply of college teachers. We have all been bombarded by the propaganda of those who believe that television, or the teaching machine, is the only way out.

One is tempted sometimes to quiet the furor by suggesting that television be combined with the teaching machine in order to do away altogether with direct contact between student and teacher. However, most of us actually engaged

in the teaching process do not really think that either of these new methods is going to enable the student to learn some things which it is essential for him to learn. Among these is the unglamorous but essential development of skills.

A moment's thought should indicate to any reasonable person that the development of skills is indispensable to all education. Some of these skills are of general importance; they are vital to the whole educational process. Such are reading, writing, calculating, etc. Others are particular and specialized to our several disciplines, such as learning to use the calculus, or to conduct a chemical experiment, or to pronounce French, or to play the violin.

<sup>1</sup>Bowling Green State University, Ohio.

While the basic principles of effective use of these skills can be inculcated in large unit instruction or demonstrated in detail by the teaching machine, they can be developed in the individual student only by individual practice under the supervision of the teacher. One can learn to do only by doing. Nobody supposes that "skull practice" can be a substitute for field practice in learning how to play football. There is no better reason for supposing that telling a student how to conduct a biological experiment, or even showing him how to conduct it, can be a substitute for having him conduct the experiment himself under the watchful eye of the teacher. As a matter of fact, so essential is experimentation to the mastering of science that every true scientist believes that if the student had to miss either the lecture or the laboratory session, he would be much better off to miss the lecture.

In the same way the student must learn how to speak by speaking. Nothing that the teacher can say can do away with the student's tongue-tied shock in finding himself on his feet before an expectant audience. Practice alone can make such a situation familiar. Similarly practice alone can overcome that utter blankness of mind with which the student inexperienced in writing faces a blank sheet of paper in the solitude of his room. Nothing that his teacher can say in the classroom can substitute for his actually attempting to put his thoughts down on paper. In the process of so doing he inevitably learns that he has to think more precisely and consecutively when he has to express himself on paper, without the help of tonal inflections and gestures, or the aid of questions from his listeners.

Even in those areas of learning which are usually considered to be bodies of knowledge, one finds on examination that certain skills are essential to the mastery of this knowledge. History is not

a mere collection of facts. It results from the skills of collecting, evaluating, and interpreting these facts. The study of literature is incomplete if the learner does not learn how to evaluate and to interpret literature for himself. To overlook the skills involved in any discipline is to reduce it to the pedantry of dead information.

Surely it must be obvious that general education is of poor quality if it produces college graduates who cannot read difficult books with understanding, or observe with accuracy and comprehension, or express themselves with grace and precision. So professional education must be of poor quality if it produces professional men without professional skills, surgeons who botch operations, highway engineers whose highways go to pieces, and teachers who transmit facts without informing the students what the facts mean or how to make use of them.

He alone really knows anything who knows what to do with his knowledge. Doing something with knowledge always involves skills. In fact, knowledge is nothing but the residue of skills applied in learning, and the most important part of knowledge is knowing how to learn. Our education is already very deficient in teaching the student how to learn, the result of allowing ourselves to be overwhelmed by the quantity of knowledge and forgetting the importance of method. We must beware of letting our education become even more conspicuously deficient by laying still greater emphasis on transmitting what the teacher knows to the student without paying correspondent attention to having the student demonstrate control over what he has learned and the ability to forge ahead for himself.

What is likely to make this problem even worse is the relatively low level of ability and motivation among students which mass education brings. Mass edu-

cation means the education of more marginal minds. To educate the mediocre is a worthy objective but a difficult one to reach. The quick mind can get along with a minimum of instruction. Slower minds are not only more numerous but require more than their proportional share of individual instruction. It is a longer and a harder job to teach an average than a good student.

The future of higher education would be easier and more pleasant if the quality of education given to our students were not going to depend on how well we develop in them the ability to perform both general and specialized skills. Our task would also be easier and more pleasant if most of our students were not going to be of ordinary intelligence and motivation, but such students are the inevitable concomitant of mass education. Not only are we going to have to develop skills in every individual in this mass, but we are going to have to work harder and longer than ever before on each individual if we are to do the job passably well.

The least expensive ways of teaching are the ancient ones of lecture and drill, and television and the teaching machine appear to be nothing but ingenious modern variants of these two ancient instructional techniques. Lecture and drill no doubt will continue to be very useful devices, but neither of them can adequately develop individual skill. Television permits the good teacher to demonstrate his skill to more students, but it does nothing to help the student to develop his own skill. The teaching machine does deal with the individual and may very effectively instruct in the general techniques of many learning skills, but the rigid context of the teaching program on the machine forbids that individual variation which is vital to the learning process.

Developing skills is only one aspect of the very complex art of teaching. It is a

process which in its lower reaches is humble and even grubby, but, unless skills are soundly developed, the towers of learning lean perilously as the foundations sink. What is the point of having a master teacher on television inspire a student by discussing a book which that student has not yet developed sufficient skill to read? Is it not apparent that the skill of checking the right blanks on the teaching machine is one which is not going to be of much use in actual life and is not likely to lead to self-learning?

What are the complaints about our graduates? That they cannot write, or speak, or think for themselves. That too many even of the graduates of professional schools, in spite of having demonstrated sufficient knowledge by examination, are not competent to apply their knowledge to the work at hand. In a word, they want skills. They are the victims of our conviction that mass education can be done en masse, with little or no consideration for the individual.

This attitude must give way to an understanding that, however multitudinous the number of students to be educated, each of them is an individual who must individually assimilate what is to be learned and must individually learn how to learn and how to use what he learned. Each must develop a dynamic set of skills by which he can continuously add to his storehouse of knowledge and by which he can continuously make use of what he has learned. If the warehouse of knowledge is to be of any use either to society or to the individual man, it must be always replenished and drawn upon by an active and vigorous mind deeply involved in transactions with the world outside. Knowledge is the fruit of learning and learning is an enterprise which requires know-how as well as capital.

Because students are individuals, each of whom must individually assimilate what is to be learned and must individ-

ually learn to use what has been assimilated, mass education can never be mechanized to the same extent as mass production of non-living materials. Mass education is a service to the individual just as mass medicine is. The student resembles the patient in having to have

his problem considered individually. The teacher resembles the physician too in advising his patient, who must then do something for himself. There is a skill in learning just as there is a skill in keeping well which every man has to learn for himself.

## A Study of the Depressed Areas

### A Survey of Class Size and Structure Among Freshman Composition Classes Throughout the Country

WILLIAM J. HOLMES, JR., and ROBERT F. McDONNELL<sup>1</sup>

To aid our department in planning the average size of its composition classes for the much-prophesied deluge of students, we decided to see what current average class sizes were in composition courses in a number of schools across the country, some purposely chosen as comparable to Ohio University, and some as not comparable. We mailed 78 questionnaires and received 60 replies which establish a pattern we feel is probably significant and certainly interesting. Since many of the replies included a request for a copy of the results, we feel that they might be of interest to a wider audience.

Our questionnaire was designed to be as simple as possible—partly because we wanted fairly simple information and partly because we wanted a high rate of response. Here it is:

| School   | No. entering freshman in Fall 1960 | Percentage of freshman class | Stu./section |
|--|------------------------------------|------------------------------|--------------|
| Exempt from freshman English   |                                    |                              |              |
| Freshman Honors English  |                                    |                              |              |
| Regular freshman English   |                                    |                              |              |
| Remedial freshman English  |                                    |                              |              |
| Other special sections, if any   |                                    |                              |              |
| What is the length, in terms of semesters or quarters, of your freshman honor English program? |                                    |                              |              |
| Remarks:   |                                    |                              |              |

We recognized that in achieving such simplicity we had sacrificed a certain amount of possibly useful information: whether remedial English carried college credit; whether grading or reading assistants were used; whether the school employed the quarter or the semester system; how many credits, quarter or semester, were given in freshman English; to what extent graduate students taught freshman English. And we did not define our terms "honors English" and "remedial English." We felt that in virtually every case in which one or more of these factors were

<sup>1</sup>Ohio University, Athens.

significant, the replier would properly qualify his answer. Our faith in the intelligence of directors of freshman English was nicely borne out; the "Remarks" section of our replies was filled with valuable qualifying information which would have been almost impossible to elicit in a structured questionnaire.

Schools to which to send these questionnaires were chosen on several bases. We wished to include colleges or universities from all parts of the country while still centering our attention upon the Midwest where our school is located. We selected schools of various sizes, both private and public. Finally, we attempted, within the limits of our knowledge and prejudice, to select schools of varying reputation. The following tables show both the range of the entering freshman class size at these schools and the variance in the number of students per section of "regular English" composition classes. Out of respect for the wishes of several of the responding schools, all colleges and universities are described by type and location only.

TABLE I (Private Schools)

| DESCRIPTION                           | ENT. FRESHMEN | STU./SECT. |
|---------------------------------------|---------------|------------|
| Middle Atlantic University a          | 1352          | 17         |
| South Atlantic University             | 1100          | 18         |
| New England University a, b           | 344           | 18         |
| New England College                   | 270           | 20         |
| Middle Atlantic University b          | 762           | 20         |
| Eastern Midwest College               | 471           | 20         |
| Northern Midwest College              | 365           | 20         |
| Northeastern University               | 380           | 21         |
| Midwest Municipal College a           | 600           | 22         |
| Northeastern University               | 800           | 22         |
| Eastern Midwest College b             | 658           | 23.5       |
| Northeastern College                  | 412           | 25         |
| New England University                | 920           | 25         |
| Eastern Midwest University b          | 472           | 25         |
| Far West University                   | 1280          | 25         |
| Eastern Midwest College a             | 700           | 25         |
| Southwestern University b             | 800           | 25         |
| Eastern Midwest University b          | 453           | 25         |
| Southern Midwest Municipal University | 565           | 25         |
| Northeastern University               | 2500          | 26         |
| Middle Atlantic University            | 3000          | 28         |
| Eastern Midwest Municipal University  | 1295          | 30         |
| New England University a, b           | 1550          | 35         |
| Eastern Midwest Municipal University  | 1090          | 35-40      |
| Northeastern Municipal College a      | 550           | 150c       |

a=urban

b=church affiliated

c=class taught by special methods

TABLE II (State Universities)

| DESCRIPTION                    | ENT. FRESHMEN | STU./SECT. |
|--------------------------------|---------------|------------|
| Southern Atlantic University a | 3799          | 15b        |
| Midwest University a           | 4852          | 21         |
| New England University a       | 800           | 21         |
| Western Midwest University a   | 2097          | 22         |
| Northern Midwest University a  | 2680          | 22         |
| Far West University            | 550           | 22         |
| Eastern Midwest University a   | 1600          | 23         |
| Southwest University a         | 1300          | 24         |
| South Atlantic University a    | 1600          | 24         |
| Southern Midwest University a  | 1850          | 24.5       |
| Southwest University a         | 1900          | 25         |

|                               |         |     |
|-------------------------------|---------|-----|
| Southern University           | 2100    | 25  |
| Northern Midwest University a | 4082    | 25  |
| Southwest University a        | 4175    | 25  |
| Far West University a         | 3562    | 25  |
| Far West College              | 758     | 26  |
| Midwest University a          | 3500    | 26  |
| Northern Midwest University   | 846     | 26  |
| Southwest University a        | 2000    | 26  |
| Southern University a         | 1850    | 26  |
| Far West University a         | 2385    | 26  |
| New England University a      | 1750    | 27  |
| Northern Midwest University   | 1900    | 27c |
| Western Midwest University a  | 2014    | 27  |
| Northern Midwest University   | 2300    | 27  |
| Western University a          | 2153    | 27  |
| Northern Midwest University a | 3600    | 28c |
| Far West University           | 2401    | 28  |
| Eastern Midwest University a  | 6300    | 28  |
| Far West University a         | unknown | 29d |
| Eastern Midwest University    | 2200    | 29  |
| Eastern Midwest University    | 3029    | 29  |
| Middle Atlantic University a  | 4000    | 30d |
| Southwest University a        | 3417    | 32  |
| Middle Atlantic University a  | 1600    | 50b |

a=primary or sole university in state system

b=writing lab section size

c=3 sections full load

d=teaching or grading assistants

According to the above tables, the average "regular English" class size for all schools responding was 25. Table III clarifies this fact.

TABLE III (Distribution of Average Class Sizes)

| AVERAGE CLASS SIZE | NUMBER OF SCHOOLS | RANK |   |
|--------------------|-------------------|------|---|
| 15                 | 1                 | 1    |   |
| 16                 |                   |      |   |
| 17                 | 1                 | 2    |   |
| 18                 | 2                 | 4    |   |
| 19                 |                   |      |   |
| 20                 | 4                 | 8    |   |
| 21                 | 2                 | 10   |   |
| 22                 | 5                 | 15   |   |
| 23                 | 2                 | 17   |   |
| 24                 | 2                 | 19   |   |
| 25                 | 14                | 33   | median and mode   |
| 26                 | 7                 | 40   |   |
| 27                 | 5                 | 45a  |   |
| 28                 | 4                 | 49a  |   |
| 29                 | 3                 | 52b  | a=one school in this group considers 3 sections a full load             |
| 30                 | 2                 | 54a  |   |
| 31                 |                   |      |   |
| 32                 | 2                 | 56   | b=one school in this group uses graduate readers or teaching assistants |
| 33                 |                   |      |   |
| 34                 |                   |      |   |
| 35                 | 1                 | 57   | c=taught by a special method  |
| 37                 | 1                 | 58   |   |
| 40                 |                   |      |   |
| 50                 | 1                 | 59b  |   |
| 150                | 1                 | 60c  |   |

KEY

Somewhat to our surprise we discovered that very little difference appears between the class sizes of state universities and those of private schools. The median for private schools is 25 while that of the state universities is 26. A further factor which should be noted is that municipal schools, which we classified as private, tend toward class sizes over 25. Schools offering a Ph.D. also have a class size median of 25; those which teach students in classes of 30 or more often require their instructors to teach only 9 hours or provide students to assist them.

A comparison between the size of regular English sections, remedial, and honors English sections is shown in Table IV.

TABLE IV

|          | STATE SCHOOLS                        |                                       | PRIVATE SCHOOLS |         |
|----------|--------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|-----------------|---------|
|          | Sections larger than regular English | Sections smaller than regular English | larger          | smaller |
| Honors   | 4                                    | 14                                    | 1               | 5       |
| Remedial | 5                                    | 10                                    | —               | 1       |

The implications seems to be that private schools tend toward smaller sections for the special programs. Though the responses are too few to allow really significant generalizations, 9 state universities have special class sizes larger than their regular class size whereas only 1 private school has.

In addition to the class size of honors and remedial sections, we were interested in the number of schools which exempt students from composition and the percentage of the freshman class they exempt or assign to the special sections. Of the 60 schools responding, 33 exempted some part of their freshman class, 43 offered an honors course—usually for fewer hours credit—to some part of their freshman class, and 24 required part of their freshman class to take sub-college, or remedial, English.

Table V shows the number of schools with special programs for their freshman class and the percentage of the freshman class involved in each program.

TABLE V

|  |    | Range of exemption | Median of range                               |
|--|----|--------------------|---|
| Number of responding schools—60          |    |                    |   |
| Number of schools EXEMPTING students     |    |                    |   |
| a) State schools                         | 15 | .001% to 10%       | 1%  |
| b) Private schools                       | 16 | .007% to 18%       | 2%  |
| c) Municipal schools                     | 2  | .1% to 10%         | —   |
| TOTAL                                    | 33 | .001% to 18%       | 1.7%  |
| Number of schools with HONORS programs   |    |                    |   |
| a) State schools                         | 31 | .016% to 46%       | 8%  |
| b) Private schools                       | 10 | .2% to 15%         | 6%  |
| c) Municipal schools                     | 2  | 4.0% to 5%         | —   |
| TOTAL                                    | 43 | .016% to 46%       | 7.1%  |
| Number of schools with REMEDIAL programs |    |                    |   |
| a) State schools                         | 19 | .228% to 48%       | 14%   |
| b) Private schools                       | 4  | 1.0% to 64%        | range too great for a median to be meaningful |
| c) Municipal schools                     | 1  | 5%                 | —   |
| TOTAL                                    | 24 | .228% to 64%       | 12 to 14%                                     |

The most interesting pattern which emerges from this table involves the contrast between the numbers of private schools offering remedial English, honors English, and exempting students. While only 4 private schools offer remedial English, 10 offer honors English, and 16 exempt students from composition. Corresponding figures for state universities are 19, 31, and 15. Since 35 state schools responded as opposed to 25 private schools, a correspondence of 7 to 5 between state and pri-

vate schools could be expected. However, the ratio for state and private schools exempting students from freshman English is 15 to 16; and the ratio for remedial programs is approximately 5 to 1. Clearly, as one would expect, private schools appear to be oriented toward the superior student more than state schools are. This appearance is perhaps most clearly perceptible in the median percentage of students exempted—1% in state schools and 2% in private schools.

Finally, we would like to offer a few subjective reactions. First, we were surprised to find that the medial class size is as high as 25 and that there is so little difference in this respect between state and private schools. Second, we were surprised, not at the lower extremity of the range in class size, but at the upper extremity: several reputable schools reported average class sizes from 30 to 40 without indicating any alleviating circumstances such as a 9-hour instructor load, use of teaching or grading assistants, or a special large-class program. Third, our surmise that other departments of English are fighting similar class-size battles was verified. We were particularly pleased at the eagerness of other English composition directors to help us in our search for information.

**Richard R. Braddock, CCCC Secretary, announces that the Placement Service for CCCC Members, very successful last year, will be conducted again this year. Details will appear in the February CCC.**

## CCCC Bulletin Board

**EDITORIAL NOTE.** With this issue of *CCC* your in-and-out Editor's split term comes to its end. The February number will be the first under the aegis of Ken Macrorie, Editor-elect, of Western Michigan University, Kalamazoo. Ken will bring to *CCC* the relevance of a frequent contributor to the official journal, the interest of long devotion to the CCCC, the time-saving maturity of previous editorial experience, and an eager zest to produce a readable and stimulating journal fully worthy of the sponsoring organization. Your retiring Editor is happy to congratulate the CCCC membership on its good fortune in securing such a well-qualified person, and to wish his successor prosperity in a demanding but challenging and rewarding undertaking.

Paul Roberts and Philip R. Wiklund complete their terms on the Editorial Board this year. The Editor wishes to thank both for valuable aid during his and their three-year terms. Officers and Executive Committee members of the CCCC and the NCTE have balloted on their successors, who will be appointed by the incoming Editor with the approval of the CCCC Executive Committee, and announced in the February *CCC*. The Editor also wishes to express gratitude to all those who have sent in manuscripts during his term, including those whose contributions, for one reason or another, could not be published.

Since the customary three-year index must be included in this issue and space required cannot be predicted accurately, a description of the other contents can be only conjectural. It seemed logical to place first Mr. Allen's informative address at the Washington meeting and to follow it with Miss Embrey's able workshop discussion on training Government writers and Mr. Hudson's more general discussion of technical writing. Next

come fact-filled papers on aspects of programs at two major universities—Iowa and Purdue—before the "Staff Room Interchange" papers, not this time a very large group. Then come two factual reports on grading experiences, and, space permitting, three other papers not readily classifiable. The accumulation of book reviews is perhaps the largest to date. The general plan of arrangement is as follows: a book of general interest, rhetoric and composition books, handbooks, books of readings, non-freshman English texts, controlled research texts, miscellaneous popular-priced paperbacks arriving in such quantity as to necessitate group reviews.

**ANNUAL REPORT OF THE CCC EDITOR TO THE NCTE.** In the third year of his term the Editor of *CCC* presents his final report without having reported on any full year of his own editorship. His absence during the middle of his term brought about this unusual state of affairs. He now reports on the October and December issues of 1960, the first of which was edited by Frank Bowman, and February and May of 1961.

Varying from the usual pattern, the October issue instead of being the largest was the smallest, running to only 60 pages against last year's 76. The decrease was due chiefly to the smaller number of workshops to be reported on—15 compared with the 25 of the preceding year. Each of the other issues had 64 pages, the usual number for non-convention issues. Total for the year was 252 compared with 268 for 1959-60.

Non-convention material followed a pattern similar to that of the preceding year. There were 47 signed articles instead of 49. Of the 47, one was a convention address; nine were panel papers (compared to the 11 of the last two years), and 13 were short "Staff Room Interchange" papers. "Staff Room,"

which had fallen off the previous year, held its own this time, appearing in only the December and May issues each year. Book reviews have continued to increase: from 13 to 31 for last year's report and to 53 for this report. In response to the Editor's pleas, several new volunteer reviewers gave valuable assistance, but still more could be used. Payment remains the same—the book or books reviewed plus what one learns while writing the review and the satisfaction of seeing some of his writing usefully in print.

Geographical distribution of contributions followed the same general pattern as last year. Articles came from 21 states, the District of Columbia, and Jamaica, as compared with 22 states, Canada, and Germany last year. California, however, relinquished its rank as the leading contributor. Illinois raised its last year's second rank to a first place tie with Michigan with five contributions each, leaving California and Ohio tied for third with four each. Arizona, Massachusetts, Oklahoma, and Texas had three each. To the Editor it seems odd that in a national organization fewer than half the 50 states would contribute articles to the official journal. Only four additional states are represented by book reviews.

The most noteworthy deviation from the usual pattern came in the February issue, much of which was devoted to "future directions" material. This issue also included a reprinting of the CCCC Constitution and By-Laws, which had last appeared in *CCC* in December, 1955. The Editor made an effort to achieve more homogeneous groupings of materials and also commissioned a few articles, including a new feature, the review-article. A particularly timely and important review-article was the one by Priscilla Tyler in the May issue on *The National Interest and the Teaching of English*. Francis Christensen and Harry H. Crosby completed their three years

of able service on the Editorial Board and were succeeded by Herman A. Estrin of the Newark College of Engineering and Priscilla Tyler of Harvard University.

The Workshop on "The Editorial Policy of *College Composition and Communication*" at Washington did not draw a large attendance, but discussion was spirited and fruitful of many promising suggestions, as is evidenced by Philip Wiklund's report in the October *CCC*. The Editor-elect, Ken Macrorie, was present throughout, and will doubtless embody a number of the suggestions, including some of his own. It seems to the retiring Editor that in the dozen years of its existence, *CCC* has grown into a professional journal of considerable stature, and he believes that its healthy growth will continue and probably accelerate.

**CHICAGO LINGUISTIC INSTITUTE.** July 11, 12, a major linguistics institute was held at the Chicago Northside Teachers College in cooperation with Chicago Junior College under the direction of Carl A. Lefevre. Besides Lefevre, other CCCC personalities participating include Priscilla Tyler, Donald J. Lloyd, and Harry R. Warfel, who spoke on applying linguistics to, respectively, word analysis and spelling, composition and reading, and literature. Dr. Margaret Shannon, Massachusetts State College, spoke on using linguistics to test knowledge of sounds and spelling.

**WASHINGTON CONVENTION POST SCRIPT.** Professor Jack C. Barnes of the University of Maryland has requested that the CCCC Bulletin Board should acknowledge the services of certain local committee members whose names did not appear in the program, as follows:

*Luncheon:* Virginia Stanton, Laurel High School

*Workshop Table:* Annette Bauman, George Washington University; Elizabeth Brown,

University of Maryland; Mary Knight, University of Maryland  
*Registration:* G. Richard Augburn, University of Maryland; Esther Birdsall, University of Maryland; Ernestine Brill, University of Maryland; Sherod Cooper, University of Maryland; Earl Dachslager, University of Maryland; Robert Hare, University of Maryland; Donald Karr, University of Maryland; Harvey Moreines, University of Maryland; Elizabeth Nelson, University of Maryland; Evelyn Rogers, University of Maryland; Robert Rutledge, George Washington University; Barbara Stevenson, University of Maryland; Elizabeth Whaley, University of Maryland  
*Finance:* Constance Demaree, University of Maryland; Edward Jones, University of Maryland; Everett Jacoby, Montgomery Jr. College; Burling Lowry, Montgomery Jr. College; Harvey Moreines, University of Maryland

**NEW EDITOR OF NEW YORK ENGLISH RECORD.** The New York State English Council has announced the appointment of Dr. Earl Harlan, Chairman of English at the State University College of Education, Plattsburgh, as Editor of *The English Record*, succeeding the late Dr. Strang Lawson of Colgate University.

**LOUISIANA COUNCIL NEWS.** From the Fall, 1961, *Newsletter* of The Louisiana Council of Teachers of English:

Dr. Dwight L. Burton, of Florida State University and editor of the *English Journal* . . . was guest speaker at the LSU Summer English Conference in June . . . The theme of the conference, in keeping with LCTE's theme for the year, was "Teaching Students to Write."

Dr. William J. Iverson of Stanford University will address high school and elementary language teachers at the state convention of the Louisiana Teachers Association in Shreveport on November 21, 1961, on "Teaching Developmental Reading Skills at the High School Level" and "Literature for Children."

**CCC SUBSCRIBERS.** Total circulation of CCC as of October, 1961, was 2,446 copies, of which 2,123 went to CCCC members and 273 to other subscribers. Total circulation of all NCTE journals was 58,274, 8,118 for *College English*.

**IOWA ASSOCIATION.** The Iowa Association of Teachers of English held its State Convention Session, October 20, 1961, at Des Moines. Dr. Ralph Nichols, Head of the Rhetoric Department, University of Minnesota, and author of *Are You Listening*, gave an address on "He Who Has Ears." Section Meetings included discussion of these topics: Reading for Everyone; The Language Arts Curriculum in Grades 7, 8, and 9; Preparing for College in the Sixties; From the Receiving End of English Teaching; More about Creative Writing; Are the First Two Years the Hardest?

**ILLINOIS ASSOCIATION.** On October 27-28 a Fall Conference for Teachers of English was held at the University of Illinois under the joint auspices of the Division of University Extension, the College of Education, the Department of English, and the Illinois Association of Teachers of English. G. Robert Carlson, First Vice-President of the National Council of Teachers of English, gave the keynote address on "Reading: This Much We Know." This was followed by a panel on "Reading." The banquet address was "A Reviewer's View of the Current Literary Scene," by Harold Lancour, Dean of the Carnegie Library School of the University of Pittsburgh. The luncheon address was "Poems for Fun," by Professor Robert D. Faner of Southern Illinois University. J. N. Hook is currently President of the IATE.

## Among the New Texts

**THE TEACHING OF ENGLISH IN THE SOUTH: THE CRUCIAL YEARS**, ed. Francis E. Bowman (The Southern Humanities Conference, 1961, 104 pp., \$1.50 to public, \$1.15 to NCTE members, paper).

This candid survey of the teaching of English in ten Southern States will be of interest to everyone concerned with improvement in writing. It recounts the typical problems met in the "crucial years," the high school years, the period of transition to college, and the first year there. Among them are listed teaching loads, over-crowded classrooms, salaries, teacher training, requirement for certification, and the loss of personnel. The successful efforts made in trying to overcome these difficulties attest to the fine spirit of the teachers in every state. There is no apology in any state report, but there is a boast that, "Where English is taught, it is second to none."

Two articles, one by James R. Squire evaluating the professional interest of Southern teachers, and the other by Francis E. Bowman analyzing the surveyed field, complete this welcome bulletin. Professor Bowman feels that these teachers have done well, but he suggests some practical means for further improvements.

FERDINAND J. WARD, C.M.  
De Paul University, Chicago

**RHETORIC FOR EXPOSITION**, Roger D. Chittick and Robert D. Stevick (Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1961, 208 pp., \$2.50).

The authors of *Rhetoric for Exposition* have set out to counter what they style the weaknesses of other rhetorics: their prescriptive approach, their preoccupation with the literary view, and their inadequate treatment of logic. They manage the first of these by pursuing a descriptive method, utilizing essays included between every two chapters or so, the second by selecting primarily non-literary essays for examination, and the third by devoting to definition, classification, syllogistic reasoning, and the inductive method seven of the book's ten chapters. The authors hope to "draw the student, inductively, into an understanding of the conventional forms of expression" through their discussion, arranged according to some of the traditional divisions of rhetoric, and through their descriptions, accomplished through close textual analysis of the essays included in the text.

The book has a great deal to recommend it. It is a rhetoric, a *university* text, and the authors have a point of view and some techniques enabling them to examine some of the problems of actual writing. Second, the textual analyses of the essays are valuable. Finally, the most gratifying feature of the book is the authors' assumption that individual responsibility is imperative to both reading and writing and their consequent omission of the customary discussions or reviews of grammar, mechanics, and punctuation. It is high time for us all to do likewise and to free ourselves for the study of style and composition.

As a basic text for the composition course, however, this book leaves much to be desired. Prescriptive techniques have produced many good writers, perhaps most of our great prose stylists. Student writers need an acceptable body of universally applicable standards and techniques. And, while they need such discussions of logic as this, they also need much more. They need to know the sentence as an act of judgment and as the basic device for developing a style. They need to know the paragraph, the plan or outline, and the execution of the whole essay as works of extended judgment and revelations of style and point of view. These things, the whole problem of style, this book does not discuss.

The conception of *Rhetoric for Exposition* deserves applause. The execution is fine as far as it goes, and it goes far enough only to make this book good collateral reading for part of a composition course.

JIM W. CORDER  
Texas Christian University

**DESIGN FOR THINKING**, Albert Upton (Stanford University Press, 1961, 240 pp., \$5.00).

This text offers the student a realistic and workable guide for the exploration of critical method. The underlying assumption of the author (one, of course, shared by men like Ivor Richards, Wendell Johnson, and S. I. Hayakawa) is that the systematic investigation of critical method must begin with the analysis of language operations and constructs, the means by which meaning is conceived and conveyed, the "meaning of meaning," etc. Language is the record of complex cerebral activity; meaning, because of the dynamic nature of lan-

guage, must be "apprehended" by the methodical (re-) construction of matrix, the inter-related physical and symbolic "environment" of words.

A good deal of attention is devoted to analytical methods: classification, structure analysis, and operation analysis. Other areas include treatments of the subjects of language growth, ambiguity, "definition," metaphor, and irony.

Upton carefully distinguishes the separate "worlds" of phenomena, perception, and symbol, emphasizing the dangers in the confusion of language and process. He reviews the statistical method, contrasts inductive and deductive techniques, and offers relevant criticisms of antiquated systems of "pseudo-logic." He speaks of "kinds" of meaning, and "kinds" of truth, making the distinction clear between concepts "empirically demonstrable," and concepts which can *only* reside in the "mind."

I believe that Upton's work will please those who believe in the necessity for (and the possibility of) teaching analytical techniques. The text *may* prove rough slogging for "slow" freshmen in First Year English programs, but the text has clear value for courses in "semantics," "general semantics," and "critical methods." The exercise materials are excellent. Mr. Upton's insights into the old fundamental problems are fresh, discriminating, and lucid. The text is well worth looking at.

DAVID L. HOROWITZ  
Arizona State University

**OUR LIVING LANGUAGE**, Kellogg W. Hunt and Paul Stoakes (Houghton Mifflin, 1961, 631 pp., \$4.75)

This freshman text has three main parts. Part I consists of twenty essays, all by twentieth-century writers, on the nature and use of the English language. Several familiar pieces are here, like George Orwell's "Politics and the English Language," Donald J. Lloyd's "Our National Mania for Correctness," and Jacques Barzun's "How to Write and Be Read"; but there are some fresh selections too, like the opposing essays that Bergen Evans and Wilson Follett wrote for successive issues of the 1960 *Atlantic*. Part II, entitled "Language in Literature," consists of eighteen short stories, two plays (*Death of a Salesman* and *Patterns*), and some fifty-three poems. Part III consists of thirteen essays about the theory and practice of literature. Those teachers who want to give the Freshman English course some subject matter and to

get their students writing about language and literature will welcome this kind of text; but such teachers may wish that the compilers had included a few more pieces, like Charlton Laird's, which deal, in some technical detail, with the history and grammar of the language.

EDWARD P. J. CORBETT  
Creighton University

**A FIRST COURSE IN COLLEGE ENGLISH**, Brent K. Ashabranner, D. Judson Milburn, and Cecil B. Williams (Houghton Mifflin, 1961, 338 pp., \$3.25, paper).

One seldom finds between two covers sufficient materials for a complete course in freshman English as it is conventionally taught. *A First Course in College English*, with its four-part division, is such a text, fulfilling its avowed goal of making it possible for the instructor to teach thoroughly without trying to teach too much. Part I treats the building of good sentences, the development of the paragraph, and the composition of the entire theme—each subdivision being supplied with copious exercises. Part II is an extensive treatment of rules and trouble spots in spelling—a section providing ample drill for weak classes or individuals or a section which could be omitted entirely in classes in which spelling is no particular problem. Part III is a functionally oriented handbook of mechanics, punctuation, grammar, and usage, each portion having its own drill exercises. Part IV consists of narrative, descriptive and expository readings, carefully selected to capture student interest and to illustrate the principles dealt with in Part I. Accompanying the reading selections are ample exercises in vocabulary and comprehension along with concrete writing assignments, a grading chart and a list of one hundred spelling demons. The entire book is written in language sufficiently simple and clear to permit the diligent student to use the text as a self-aid.

E. S. CLIFTON  
North Texas State University

**ESSENTIALS OF EFFECTIVE WRITING**, Vincent C. Hopper and Cedric Gale (Barron's Educational Series, 1961, 203 pp., \$1.50, paper); **PRACTICE FOR EFFECTIVE WRITING**, Vincent C. Hopper and Cedric Gale (Barron's Educational Series, 1961, 160 pp., \$1.50).

The fact that **ESSENTIALS OF EFFECTIVE WRITING** is deductive in its approach to the teaching of English gives one

the impression that it is an older book than the date of publication (1961) proves it to be. Although the inevitable rule-illustration arrangement gives it a somewhat outdated appearance, the book provides a ready reference for a student searching for a particular rule and an illustration and in most cases offers enough examples to be effective. The handling of some material, such as that on fragments and comma splices, is good; that of other material, such as that on gerunds, is less valuable.

**PRACTICE FOR EFFECTIVE WRITING**, the workbook which accompanies **ESSENTIALS OF EFFECTIVE WRITING**, suffers from the common defects of such supplementary aids. Although it faithfully follows the text and provides opportunities for recognition of constructions and of types of errors, it offers the student very little opportunity to make any association between his findings and the writing of a composition. As busy work or as a guide in preparing for certain kinds of examinations, it might be helpful; as an aid to actual writing, it is definitely limited in its possibilities.

The combination of text and workbook would probably be useful in a remedial course, but it would offer able students very little stimulation.

LURENE BROWN  
Ohio University, Athens

**MODERN RHETORIC**, Cleanth Brooks and Robert Penn Warren, shorter ed. (Harcourt, Brace & World, 1961, 376 pp., \$2.95, paper).

The complete Brooks and Warren, long since eminent as a full course in freshman English, is because of its extended, almost encyclopedic nature a manual for teachers rather than a working text for students. The shorter edition is a better book. It properly achieves concentration on exposition and argumentation by omitting the grammar handbook—a tiresome and probably useless adjunct to any book dealing with writing problems, which are seldom illuminated and never solved in grammatical terms (the backward student, when identified, can be advised to purchase a good remedial handbook for a dollar). A further improvement over the complete edition has resulted from the excision of readings, leaving the instructor free to choose, perhaps, a paperback volume of essays or a nine-months run of *Harper's* or the *Atlantic*, if he feels that contemplation of the

contemporary scene will stimulate the thinking of his charge.

The Shorter Edition—seldom hurried on that account—retains the virtues of the longer work. Its illustrations, often student-composed, are timely and its exercises intrinsically interesting. As a decent book on writing must be, it is well written; it imparts a sense of continuity. The section on the research paper is particularly well done.

But certain of the old shortcomings remain. The Shorter Edition, despite the sense of continuity, lacks organization. Its treatment of diction and sentence style, for example, is deferred for chapters nine and ten, although these are matters calling for discussion at the beginning (Part I is entitled "Making a Beginning"). And Chapter Three, "Organizing the Composition," never quite accomplishes its presumed purpose: showing inexperienced writers the methods used by experienced essayists in analyzing and synthesizing ideas.

LYLE H. KENDALL  
Texas Christian University

**MODERN AMERICAN WRITER**, Roma A. King, Jr., and Frederick R. McLeod (American Book Company, 1961, 448 pp., \$4.50).

King and McLeod (both of the University of Kansas City) declare that their freshman handbook is written for the student. By student they evidently mean one with only rudimentary skills in reading and writing. In twelve chapters the authors discuss the basic problems of writing in the most direct and simple language. The format is designed for maximum readability and usefulness: the headings are numerous and boldface, the type large, the white space lavish.

Like most handbook writers today, the authors profess allegiance to modern descriptive linguistics; but also like their competitors, they include much prescriptive grammar. Thus, they define *noun* in terms of structural features (position, inflection, suffixes), and then add the traditional definition—"the name of a person, place or thing."

King and MacLeod affirm that their modern approach extends to rhetoric as well. They have avoided "literary" examples in favor of "good twentieth-century writing." *Literary* apparently refers to older literary classics, for many of the writers sampled, such as Dwight MacDonald, Alan Paton,

and Edmund Wilson, could scarcely be called "non-literary."

If used in freshman sections where fundamentals of composition are stressed, this text should prove satisfactory. But it is definitely not for the better-than-average or superior student.

RICHARD F. BAUERLE  
Ohio Wesleyan University

**CONCISE ENGLISH HANDBOOK**, Hans P. Guth (Wadsworth Publishing Company, 370 pp., \$2.50, paper).

Guth's **CONCISE ENGLISH HANDBOOK** is well named, being complete and informative without unnecessary elaboration. Opening with a brief, yet comprehensive, review of formal grammar, it progresses in orderly fashion from word to sentence to paragraph to theme. Exercise material is well planned and more than adequate. There appear to be no significant omissions in the content of the book, and explanations are terse and lucid.

Any weakness of the **HANDBOOK** lies in format rather than content. A paperback, no matter how desirable, is less likely to survive the rigors of the freshman course, for which this book is eminently well suited, than a clothbound text; and there is, also, a certain initial confusion in the *G 10a st* and *D 8b w* to be found as a somewhat doubtful "guide on each page."

**CONCISE ENGLISH HANDBOOK** is basically sound, however, and is suitable not only for freshmen, but for advanced students who need a reliable reference book. Its usefulness could extend from the small school with a select group of students to the state universities.

LURENE BROWN  
Ohio University, Athens

**PRACTICAL ENGLISH HANDBOOK**, Floyd C. Watkins and Edwin T. Martin (Houghton Mifflin Company, 1961, 450 pp., \$3.75).

Intended for classroom drill on fundamentals and for use as a writers reference, this handbook makes a compact but comprehensive presentation of the elements of language and composition. Four major parts compose the whole: (1) sentence structure and grammar, (2) conventions, (3) words, and (4) larger units. In addition to covering the writing of themes and research papers, the fourth part includes a short section on clear thinking.

The authors make what they call a "practical and functional" approach to handbook subject matter. Omitting discussions of theory and long explanations of principles, they restrict their text to statements of fundamentals and practices and to illustrations and exercises. Their emphasis is always on the more troublesome points of language and composition. As a practical and functional approach, this is not, by any means, a novel treatment. But what distinguishes **PRACTICAL ENGLISH HANDBOOK** is the pointed manner in which the authors present their material. Their statements of principles and practices are concise and unequivocal; their sample sentences and exercises, drawn from student and professional writers, are clear and to the point. This should prove to be a useful handbook for freshman composition. An instructor's edition is available.

WILFRED A. FERRELL  
Arizona State University

**WORDS IN CONTEXT**, A. A. De Vitis and J. R. Warner (Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1961, 333 pp., \$2.95, paper).

This workbook *cum* essay anthology is designed to increase the vocabulary of college students. It is divided into sixteen major sections, each containing an essay or selection of poetry (with certain words underlined), and a number of exercises which ought to cause students to learn a great deal about certain aspects of their language. Authors represented range from Shakespeare to Niebuhr, with expected and unexpected names included. Diagnostic pre- and post-tests, a long dictionary exercise, four vocabulary tests, and sections dealing with roots, prefixes and suffixes, levels of usage, and so on, increase the usefulness of the book.

The authors state that ". . . probably no student, unless his memory is exceptional, will very greatly increase the actual number of words he knows as a result of one semester's work. Instead, most students will for the first time become keenly aware of words as words and will discover their fascination." Such an assertion seems to me to question the value, not only of this book, but of all "vocabulary" courses. Is the result indicated in the quotation significant enough to cause students (and instructors) to devote fifteen — thirty — or forty-five hours to achieving it?

GEORGE F. ESTEY  
Boston University

**A WORKBOOK FOR WRITERS, H. J. Sachs, Harry M. Brown, and P. Joseph Canavan, alternate form (American Book Company, 1961, 294 pp., \$2.90).**

This workbook is obviously designed for use in high schools or in college remedial English programs, for it covers only the most elementary principles of sentence structure, grammar, mechanics, and word study. It includes diagnostic and achievement keys for approximately a third of the exercises, and a comprehensive drill section on punctuation. The exercises are simple and the explanatory material is brief.

WILFRED A. FERRELL  
Arizona State University

**75 PROSE PIECES, Robert C. Rathburn and Martin Steinman, Jr. (Scribner's, 1961, 493 pp., \$2.95, paper).**

Here's another freshman reader, but maybe this one has the secret. Its editors seem to have kept faith with their format and thus achieved a range that may be understated in the "75" of the title. Aiming for an "aid to writing, especially expository writing, in composition and communication courses," they have sampled prose which presents (I) 'principles of writing,' (II) rhetorical modes ('Narration,' 'Description,' 'Definition,' 'Analysis,' etc.) and (III) rhetorical form ('Biography,' 'Character Sketches,' 'Reviews,' etc.). The range is extended further by the versatility of the pieces (for example, a *biography* might readily be studied as a *narrative*, too) and by the sweep of subject areas furnishing the prose selections. Most of the contributors' names have a familiar ring (Huxley, Mencken, Santayana, Twain), and while the titles may not be so well known, the pieces appear to illustrate the specific modes and forms and principles with calculated precision. Headnotes averaging a page in length introduce each category in a sensible way; the one which precedes the documented research article might be particularly useful.

GEORGE HERMAN  
Arizona State University

**READINGS AND ASSIGNMENTS, Kenneth L. Knickerbocker and Bain Tate Stewart (Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1961, 483 pp., \$4.50).**

In what seems to be an inspired selection of reading material the authors of *Readings and Assignments* enable a teacher—even an inexperienced teacher—to be effective in the classroom. The readings combine the functions of lure and persuas-

sive impact, and the *assignments* stress the art of the utilization of knowledge.

Unlike many College Readers, the selections are varied, short, and range from the serious to the comic. Without exaggeration, this book is one of the most interesting texts from the viewpoint of motivating the student to read more and to write better. In those schools or areas of the country where library facilities are limited, this book will be worthwhile for the freshman college student.

The book is divided into sections: "Practical Approaches To Writing," "How To Write About Fiction" and "How To Write About Poetry," and "From Reading To Writing." The expository statements which preface each section are effectively presented. The poetry selections offer most of the old favorites with a comprehensive introduction that clears the way for student interpretation of the poems. As a matter of fact, throughout the book the implicit drive is to motivate the student to think.

CLARA M. SIGGINS  
Boston College

**THE COMPLETE READER, ed. Richard S. Beal and Jacob Korg (Prentice-Hall, 1961, 630 pp., \$4.95).**

**THE COMPLETE READER** almost lives up to its title. By varying the size of type, eliminating all apparatus except for four brief introductory passages, and allowing virtually no space between selections, the editors have compressed into 626 pages 37 nonfiction selections, 21 short stories, 3 plays, and 137 poems, making the book eminently usable for regular and accelerated freshman composition courses, some advanced composition courses, and introductory literature courses organized by types or forms. The chronological range is wide: the poetry begins with the medieval ballad and ends with Dylan Thomas. The selection of short stories is cosmopolitan: Joyce, Kafka, James, Chekhov, de Maupassant, Greene, and Hemingway, among others, are represented. The drama section offers Sophocles, Shakespeare, and Shaw; nonfiction ranges from Joseph Addison to Joseph Wood Krutch, Robert Benchley to Bertrand Russell. Few will quarrel with the selections; the insistence in the introductions, however, on predicting "intention" in all forms of writing will perhaps alienate instructors of a different critical persuasion.

GENE MONTAGUE  
Arizona State University

**PERSONAL INTEGRITY**, ed. William M. Schutte and Erwin R. Steinberg (W. W. Norton Co., 1961, 192 pp., \$1.25, paper).

Present and projected collections of materials discussing vital problems of modern man indicate a significant new trend in composition readers, and *Personal Integrity* seems destined to be one of the best. This assembly of essays, letters, fiction, interview, biography, and sermon presenting opinions and definitions of the title topic should provide not only provocative student thought, discussion, and writing, but also an excellent springboard for independent study beyond the text (for this the editors have included eighty-four leading theme-and-discussion questions and a long collateral reading list). The selections in the volume range from the *O.E.D.* to *The New York Times*, from Plato to Sinclair Lewis, from Horace to Madame Curie. But this is not a careless mixture; it will give the student a depth probe along with a wide view. It will challenge him, giving him plenty to talk about. And it is good reading.

WILLIAM E. MORRIS  
Ohio University, Athens

**SCIENCE AND SOCIETY**, Thomas D. Clareson (Harper & Brothers, 1961, 331 pp., \$4.00).

This is a collection of essays written during the 1950's by such noted men of science as Arthur H. Compton, J. Bronowski, J. Robert Oppenheimer, Fred Hoyle, and Julian Huxley. The essays, which are of general rather than specialized interest, are grouped under five headings: Science and the Student; The Nature of Science and the Scientific Method; The Scientist and Modern Society; Science and Education; Science, Philosophy, and Religion. Each of the first four sections is followed by instructions about expository writing; and since the readings can also be used for a controlled term paper, there is a sixth section on the reference paper. For the English teacher who has no objection to taking all knowledge for his province in the classroom, this will prove to be a fascinating and useful collection of essays. But this text will probably find greatest favor in English classes in polytechnic colleges. The instructional matter is disappointingly sketchy, and the model footnotes, which, the editor claims, follow the *MLA Style Sheet*, contain a number of errors.

EDWARD P. J. CORBETT  
Creighton University

**READ AND WRITE: STUDIES IN CURRENT PROSE**, Henry Van Slooten and John C. Bushman (Harper & Brothers, 1961, 202 pp., \$2.75, paper).

**READ AND WRITE** is an intelligently edited reader-workbook containing 28 short contemporary essays by writers as various as Richard Armour and Bertrand Russell. The editors have made the student's task easier by appending to each selection an analysis setting out salient facts about the author, his purpose and audience, the central idea of the essay, and the rhetorical principles it embodies. Following the analysis is a series of exercises testing reading comprehension, largely by multiple choice questions. Finally, the editors pose a writing problem growing out of the essay; apparently they anticipate no very ambitious or detailed response, since the space provided for the theme is never more than a page and a half and frequently is only a half page. The book should function well in either remedial or regular freshman composition courses, especially in programs taught by graduate assistants or others who find much apparatus desirable.

GENE MONTAGUE  
Arizona State University

**AN INTRODUCTION TO JOURNALISM**, F. Fraser Bond, 2nd ed. (The Macmillan Co., 1961, 359 pp., \$5.25).

This text is a comprehensive, compact account of contemporary American journalism and meets the needs of students and instructors of mass communications.

Especiably for those interested in the collegiate press Bond presents a pertinent section "Columns, Columnists, and Commentators"; an inspiring account of "The Editorial and the Editorial Page"; and a worthwhile discussion of "Journal Reviews the Arts," in which he offers methods of a reviewer's evaluation and lists sound principles of book, play, television, radio, motion picture, and music reviewing. Through his wide experiences in journalism Bond offers the reader informative accounts of the history, development, and skill of advertising in the mass media, the wise use of public relations; and law as it is applied to journalism.

Although Bond presents an excellent chapter "The 'Morgue' and Reference Library," I feel that he should have prepared a selected bibliography at the end of the book.

Of particular interest are the effects of new technology on journalism: the impact of television and radio on sports writing, the growing development of color in news pictures, and the use of videotape on TV news shows.

HERMAN A. ESTRIN  
Newark College of Engineering

**BUSINESS COMMUNICATION FOR BETTER HUMAN RELATIONS**, Charles C. Parkhurst (Prentice-Hall, 1961, 579 pp., \$7.50).

If one carefully reads the preface of this new and fifth edition of Parkhurst's communication book he will save time in checking on its additions and improvements to the earlier works. All are mentioned in the preface! The arrangement of the chapters with theory, illustrations, questions and problems is similar to the better present type texts.

Some of the better features of the book are found in the extensive treatment of good will letters in Chapter Six, the illustrations of letters for sales promotion in Chapter Ten, and those of collection letters in Chapter Twelve. The material is so ample that classroom presentation, and even class preparation, will not be burdensome.

In the face of the Ford and Carnegie Foundations' recommendations to eliminate letter writing on the university level, this good book seems "to have come too late." For use in sophomore year, Parkhurst has devoted too many pages, 107, in the first four chapters of his book for preliminary work; he has done the same in his reference sections, giving four chapters and 102 pages to grammar, punctuation, trite words, and misused words. After their intensive freshman composition courses, second year men will have been well drilled in form, good paragraphs, and diction.

The chapter on "The Business Report" is not extensive, but is sufficiently long for two or three one-hour classes. It has a helpful bibliography of guides, yearbooks, reports, directories, and other needed books for gathering materials for reports.

FERDINAND J. WARD, C.M.  
De Paul University, Chicago

**REPORT WRITING FOR BUSINESS**, Raymond V. Lesikar, (Richard D. Irwin, 337 pp., \$6.95).

Like other Irwin texts this is sturdily bound to withstand usage, and it has an appealing format to make its contents easy to grasp. It begins with an introduction to

report writing; it follows logically through the typical stages of a report; and it closes with a practical check for finished reports. Throughout the chapters are illustrations, tables and graphs of which many are not too clear.

Among its good features are the "Table of Contents" amply extended for an understanding of the chapters; a long bibliography in Chapter Four with listings from books, periodicals and government reports for each heading; and the examination for a finished report. Students will be impressed with the framed reports in Chapter Six, for these are simple to understand, and they are in different type from that used in the chapters.

Except for these things, one will find a pronounced similarity between this new text and *Business Report Writing* written by Robert D. Hay and the present author, and published by the Irwin firm in 1957. The table of contents of this text stripped of its descriptions, the material and wording of most of the chapters, the questions at the end of the chapters, many of the graphs, and the general format are identical with the new book.

"Report Writing for Business" is thoroughly academic in its tone and approach; and it will be satisfactory for university classes.

FERDINAND J. WARD, C.M.  
De Paul University

**PLAYWRITING**, Bernard Grebanier (Thomas Y. Crowell Company, 1961, 386 pp., \$4.25).

Professor Grebanier has produced a welcome antidote to the platitudinous, overly-theoretical approach to playwriting taken by many others. Convinced that playwriting can, in fact, be taught like any skill, he provides a pretty complete course in the pages of his book. The principles of the craft of playwriting are not only stated in workaday language ("the characterization must be revealed basically through the action of the characters") but are also amply illustrated and are further reinforced with the author's sound knowledge of the aesthetics involved. As a result this is not exactly the simple handbook he pretends to have written. Just how useful the book might be in the classroom will be determined by how much or little of his own theories and practices the teacher wishes to convey or assert. He might dispute, for instance, the value of the "Proposition" as a method of plot analysis or possibly con-

sider Grebanier's treatment occasionally too simple. The author's very thoroughness, that is, may actually restrict the usefulness of the book to those beginners who have no teacher to guide them, in which case it would be unexcelled. It may be recommended, however, as highly informative reading for any student of playwriting and as a helpful guide, at least, for any teacher as well.

JOHN PATTON  
Albright College

A MILTON DICTIONARY, Edward S. Le Comte (Wisdom Library, 1961, 358 pp., \$1.65).

The *Dictionary*, an invaluable guide to any Milton text, combines the functions of glossary, index, and handbook. The descriptive entries for Milton's works are excellent, especially for the sonnets and for *Comus*, under which Le Comte summarizes Psellos's neo-Platonic "On Circe." Milton's significant contemporaries are included, as are major poets he has influenced and many editors and critics. For these last one might prefer, instead of alphabetical entries, a separate bibliography with more names and briefer comments. Le Comte minimizes the debt to Hughes and might profitably have summarized Bush's account of Milton's ethical and spiritual ideas (*Paradise Lost in Our Time*) instead of the textual errors in Bohn.

The definitions and identifications are comprehensive and sound. Le Comte proves far more than the "mousehunt of an index" in offering original scholarship as well as thorough research and critical judgment. Praiseworthy examples include the account of Alpheus, the clarification of a pun on "canon bit," and a good survey of meanings of "haemony." Among the few weaknesses, "Urania" is inadequately explained. No entry appears for Muse or Glassy Sea. "Arian" needs revision since Hunter's research. Some disproportion is inevitable: Le Comte leaves "mire cogitativus" untranslated under "Bernard," but defines "degradation" as "degradation." Under "engine" admittedly frivolous suggestions rob Howard's and Whiting's reasonable ones of space. An inferior entry offers a farfetched parallel between Adam and "ULYSSES at the court of ALCINOUS," plus the gratuitous conjecture that Adam perhaps had red hair.

ANN GOSSMAN  
Texas Christian University

THOREAU: MAN OF CONCORD, ed. Walter Harding (Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1960, pp., \$2.00, paper).

This superb collection by a well-known Thoreau scholar of selections from biographical materials on Thoreau is concerned not with his ideas but his qualities as a man. By formal listing it contains 185 "documents" (the editor's term for any general source; by actual count it includes 279 "items" this reviewer's term for individual selections), the average occupying less than a page. The collection, extending from 1847 to 1932, is rich, varied, and representative. Its organization, however, definitely prescribes its role as a text, for the editor has (1) arranged the selections in order of their publication, not reference, to simulate conditions of work in a library, (2) suggested 31 topics for papers, (3) provided a Thoreau chronology and bibliography (somewhat meager), identifying notes on the "authors" (full and useful), and instructions on writing a paper (casual and airy). Practically no explanatory annotation occurs. Surprising is the omission of bibliographically relevant items by Thoreau himself (from the *Journal* and letters, for instance). It must be granted that the old dilemma of what to put in and leave out, for teacher and student, has not been perfectly solved here, but to the instructor in Freshman English who considers biographical problems a fruitful ground for his students to cultivate, this book has much to offer.

PHILIP R. WIKELUND  
Indiana University

WOODCRAFT, William Gilmore Simms, ed. Richmond Croom Beatty (W. W. Norton Co., 1961, 518 pp., \$1.95, paper).

In editing this representative Simms' novel which deals with the immediate post-Revolution scene in South Carolina, Mr. Beatty has provided a valuable service to historians of the South and to students of regional American literature. His Introduction is an appeal for a reconsideration of Simms on the grounds that he is more than just a Southern Cooper who furnishes a "stirring panorama" of frontier life in South Carolina, and that Simms' characters, as Professor Donald Davidson has written, "are so characteristically American that it would be hard to find anywhere . . . a better representation of our supposed national temperament and principles."

LESTER JAY MARKS  
Ohio University

**GULLIVER'S TRAVELS**, Jonathan Swift, ed. Robert A. Greenberg (W. W. Norton and Co., 1961, 361 pp., \$1.95, paper).

This edition in a sound text is indispensable for those who want an up-to-date and balanced understanding of modern critical responses to a much-used and provocative masterpiece. The critical essays by S. H. Monk, R. S. Crane, G. Wilson Knight, J. M. Murry, Ricardo Quintana, Basil Willey, F. R. Leavis, and others, explore the *Travels* from several viewpoints. Crucial matters for a thorough and consistent understanding of the work—Gulliver's pride, the evolution of his character, the quality and depth of Swift's irony, and most important, the meaning of the voyage to the country of the Houyhnhnms—are analyzed with vigor and with refreshing differences of opinion.

JOHN A. JONES  
Ohio University, Athens

**A CASEBOOK ON GULLIVER AMONG THE HOUYHNHNM**, ed. Milton P. Foster (Crowell, 1961, 319 pp., \$2.50, paper).

This book, which includes the text of the fourth book of *Gulliver's Travels*, a summary of the other three books, and twenty-six critical essays ranging from the 1752 commentary of John Boyle, Earl of Orrery, to the 1960 commentary of Charles Peake, could admirably serve as a beginning for controlled research in freshman English (but not for very weak students) and as a handbook for teachers and graduate students. The bibliography is helpful, as are many of the suggested research topics, although a few of these are too broad or too advanced for the average freshman student.

CLARIS GLICK  
Arizona State University

**SHAKESPEARE'S JULIUS CAESAR**, ed. Julian Markels (124 pp.); **TWO MODERN AMERICAN TRAGEDIES**, ed. John D. Hurrell (153 pp.); **EXTRASENSORY PERCEPTION**, ed. Fabian Gudas (141 pp.); **THE HUNGARIAN REVOLT**, ed. Richard Lettis and William E. Morris (219 pp.). All are Scribner Research Anthology paperbacks, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1961, \$1.95 each.

If English teachers needed any evidence of the growing popularity of controlled-research texts, they would have to note only the more than sixty texts now available and the new series that appear each year from rival publishing houses. Scribner's has now entered this lucrative field with four handsomely edited texts.

Each of these volumes contains, in addition to the source material, a section explaining the nature and methods of research, a general introduction to the topic of the volume, a list of suggested term-paper topics, and a guide to supplementary research. All the bibliographical information necessary for documentation is available on the first page of each article, and pagination is clearly marked in boldface type right in the text of the article. Some of the other research series have been inexcusably remiss in supplying bibliographical data.

The *Julius Caesar* volume prints the text of the play. The *Two Modern American Tragedies* volume does not print the text of *Death of a Salesman* and *A Streetcar Named Desire*, but both those plays are readily available in inexpensive paperbacks. The *Hungarian Revolt* volume carries sixteen contemporary accounts of those heroic days from October 23 to November 4, 1956—an event that is still very much alive in the memories of our freshman students. In addition, there are some photographs, a map of downtown Budapest, a chart giving the structure of the Hungarian government, and a glossary of terms. The most fascinating of these texts is the *Extrasensory Perception*. Students need not be familiar with the science of parapsychology to understand and enjoy the lively dialogue that goes on among the articles in this volume.

EDWARD P. J. CORBETT  
Creighton University, Omaha

**ESSENTIAL WORKS OF STOICISM**, ed. Moses Hadas (Bantam Books, 1961, 206 pp., \$50, paper); **ESSENTIAL WORKS OF DESCARTES**, intro. Daniel J. Bronstein (Bantam, 1961, 233 pp., \$60, paper); **ESSENTIAL WORKS OF JOHN STUART MILL**, ed. Max Lerner (Bantam, 1961, 434 pp., \$75, paper).

These volumes, all Bantam Classics, are presented as part of the Library of Basic Ideas. Each has with the text an introduction and a bibliography including both primary and secondary works.

*Essential Works of Stoicism* contains works by Diogenes Laertius, *Life of Zeno*, by Cleanthes, *Hymn to Zeus*, by Seneca, *On Tranquility*, by Epictetus, *The Manual*, and by Marcus Aurelius, *To Himself*. The translations are by C. D. Yonge, James Adam, W. B. Langsdorf, and George Long respectively, Long being the translator of the last two works. The introduction by

Moses Hadas, along with brief discussions of the authors, has a good account of the search for self-sufficiency and the Stoic tradition.

The second volume, *Essential Works of Descartes*, contains *Discourse on Method*, *The Passions of the Soul*, the *Meditations*, and the important letters, all translated by Lowell Blair. Daniel J. Bronstein's introduction discusses Descartes' method, his influence, and his relationship to both skeptical and rationalistic modes of thought.

Included in *Essential Works of John Stuart Mill* are *Utilitarianism*, *On Liberty*, *The Utility of Religion*, *Nature*, and *Autobiography*. Max Lerner's introduction is an effective combination of biography and intellectual history.

These volumes, in attractive and inexpensive format, would be useful in many great books courses and, for corollary reading, in almost any course in the humanities.

JIM W. CORDER

Texas Christian University

**DEMOCRACY**, Henry Adams, Foreword, Henry D. Aiken (New American Library, 1961, 191 pp., \$.50, paper). **MONT-SAINT-MICHEL AND CHARTRES** (New American Library, 1961, 383 pp., \$.75, paper).

In his *Education* Henry Adams comments on the students he faced as assistant professor of history: "Nine minds in ten take polish passively, like a hard surface; only the tenth sensibly reacts." It is the tenth student for whom these new paperbacks will be most valuable. The teachers of honors sections of freshman English should be pleased by their appearance. *Democracy*, in particular, is a useful volume, for with its sophisticated analysis of uninhibited political energy it should cause the bright student to re-examine some of his political clichés and perhaps help him to express his ideas in fresher, more logical terms. Henry Aiken's literary analysis in the foreword is probably unsuitable for freshmen, but his penetrating questions about the nature of democracy should lead to good ideas for themes.

*Mont-Saint-Michel and Chartres*, in form and substance the superior work, may well be beyond even "the tenth" student. Yet the rare student who can sustain an interest in the thirteenth century will find in the metaphors dealing with Gothic art some brilliant and astonishingly relevant insights.

CLINTON KEELER  
Oklahoma State University

**GETTING ALONG IN FRENCH**, Mario Pei and John Fisher; **GETTING ALONG IN ITALIAN**, Mario Pei; **GETTING ALONG IN SPANISH**, Mario Pei and Eloy Vaquero; **GETTING ALONG IN GERMAN**, Mario Pei and Robert Politzer; **GETTING ALONG IN RUSSIAN**, Mario Pei and Fedor I. Nikanov (Bantam Reference Library paperbacks ranging from 181 to 228 pp., \$.60 each).

These small paperbacks have practically everything!—certainly much more than the usual tourist "phrase book." Besides 90 pages of conversational sentences, vocabularies, grammar summary, there are even remarks on the history of that language, extent of its use today, and indications of some local customs and gestures.

The happiest feature is the informal, chatty style by which Mario Pei charms his readers and has earned for himself a reputation of "popularizer of linguistics." As a Columbia University professor of Romance Philology, he has the academic foundation to assure authenticity; besides, his is the happy faculty of putting scholarly facts within easy, entertaining comprehension of the layman, keeping them lively and up-to-date rather than dryly pedantic.

Our only question is on the English-equivalents used for pronunciation. Most of them are excellent and realistic. And such a method is, admittedly, more practical for the student without a teacher. Even Mr. Pei admits they are at best "an unsatisfactory makeshift," and efforts should be made to hear correct pronunciation. Even so, such a designation as AW for the French open o (resulting in BAWN for *bonne*) could surely have as well been given as the inverted c, which resembles "an open o." In German using -UHR and -UHN for final -er and -en results in the (erroneous) sound an American would give them if left on his own!

In spite of several such misleading indications, these books are practical and compact, easy enough for the tourist yet not too superficial to be shunned for classroom use. They are surely the best available of their type.

BITA MAY HALL  
Texas Christian University

**CANDIDE**, etc., Voltaire, trans. and ed. Donald M. Frame; **FATHERS AND SONS**, Ivan Turgenev, trans. George Reavy with Foreword by Alan Hodge; **ROBINSON CRUSOE**, Daniel Defoe, ed. Harvey Swados; **THE FARM**, Louis

Bromfield, ed. Russell Lord (The New American Library, 1961, 351, 207, 316, 350 pp., first three 50 cents, **THE FARM**, 75 cents, paper).

Of these four volumes recently added to the New American Library's Signet Classics list, the Voltaire entry is perhaps the most impressive. The sixteen stories include "Candide" and "Zadig," as well as interesting and worthwhile lesser tales. Donald Frame's new translation is highly readable and adapted for student use; his introduction provides appropriate background and briefly discusses the theme of each story without removing the necessity for the student's own probings of the Voltairean idea. There are useful footnotes in the text and a "Notes and Glossary" section and selective reading list at the end.

Alan Hodge's foreword to *Fathers and Sons* is commendable for its brevity and provocativeness ("*Fathers and Sons* is not a study in the doctrine of Nihilism"; "his [Turgenev's] supreme interest lay in people, not in opinions"). It should arouse student interest without saying too much. But the selective reading list is entirely too brief to be of much value (three entries under "books about Turgenev").

The afterword to Defoe's classic by Harvey Swados has been previously published elsewhere. Useful and stimulating as it is in another context, it seems inappropriate—or no more in place than several other Defoe essays one might think of—attached to the end of this edition. Swados argues for the novel as an adult classic and makes interesting observations about Alexander Selkirk's adventures as a basis for Crusoe's story.

Louis Bromfield's *The Farm* is scarcely more than a minor classic, but it is good to have it readily available in a paperback reprint. Russell Lord provides an afterword that is a nostalgic personal memoir of the author.

#### WARREN I. TITUS

George Peabody College for Teachers  
**FIVE SHORT NOVELS**, Ivan Turgenev, Trans. & ed. Franklin Reeve (425 pp., \$.75); **AKHMANOVA RUSSIAN DICTIONARY** (820 pp., \$.95); **HITLER: A STUDY IN TYRANNY**, Allan Bullock (780 pp., \$.95.); **THE OPERATORS**, Frank Gibney (229 pp., \$.50); **SWEET THURSDAY**, John Steinbeck (180 pp., \$.50); **THE HEART IS A LONELY HUNTER**, Carson McCullers (307 pp., \$.75); **50 GREAT POETS**, ed. Milton Crane (591 pp., \$.95). All are 1961 Ban-

tam Books paperbacks.

**FIVE SHORT NOVELS** — Turgenev. In any study of Criticism, the Novel, or in a Comparative Literature course, this edition of Turgenev's **FIVE SHORT NOVELS** should be included. Although short, the novels are complete and all illustrate Turgenev's purpose which is to portray life—most of it his own. **FIRST LOVE** the most poetic of the novels is the most melodramatic. **SPRING TORRENTS** is one of the most moving of his stories. Both are written from his own experience.

**THE AKHMANOVA RUSSIAN DICTIONARY** has been designed as a practical dictionary for the English-speaking student who wishes to learn Russian, as well as for the Russian-speaking student who wishes to learn English. Fortunately for English readers who have no knowledge at all of the Russian language there is an excellent introduction entitled "Use of the Dictionary." Also included are a key to pronunciation and general rules for its use.

**HITLER: A STUDY IN TYRANNY** — Alan Bullock. Teachers of Rhetoric will be interested in the evidences in this well-documented historical narrative of Hitler's unequalled grasp of what could be done by propaganda to move the masses.

**THE OPERATORS** — Frank Gibney. According to Gibney our national future is being misshaped by the witless optimists who permit themselves to be defrauded by the operator. This book is of interest not only as a social commentary on big and little business, but because of its enlightening summary of the semantic marvels of advertising. This book could serve as a good supplementary reference in teaching argumentation and persuasion.

**SWEET THURSDAY** is a typical Steinbeck novel, deceptively simple, sympathetic, and understanding. Wisdom-embedded humor shows Steinbeck a close observer of the contemporary scene. On p. 122 for example: "If a man has any money he doesn't ask, 'Can I afford this?' but, 'Can I deduct it?' Two men fight over a luncheon check when both of them are going to deduct it anyway—a whole nation conditioned to dishonesty by its laws, because honesty is penalized." (Sounds like a page from **THE OPERATORS**, doesn't it?)

**THE HEART IS A LONELY HUNTER** — Carson McCullers. This sensitively written novel should be included on reading lists to illustrate local color and the skillful use of the technique of realism. For teachers of

the Novel and/or American literature, this novel is useful to dramatize social problems in the South. With a minutiae of detail and with masterly dialogue we see poverty, inequality, hunger for friendship and fear of being forgotten. These dominant threads in the story are also found in *SWEET THURSDAY* by John Steinbeck.

**50 GREAT POETS** — edited by Milton Crane. A survey of poetry of the Western World from ancient Greece to modern America. The virtue of this edition is that the poems are not the stereotyped selections one usually finds in anthologies. E. A. Robinson, for example, is represented by "Isaac and Archibald" and several sonnets instead of the usual psychological vignettes. The lesser known poems of Rilke and of Cummings are a pleasure to find here. It is interesting also to have two different translations of Horace's "Odes"—one by Milton, the other by Hight.

CLARA M. SIGGINS  
Boston College

**JOSEPH ANDREWS**, Henry Fielding, ed. Martin C. Battestin (Houghton Mifflin, 1961, 323 pp., \$.95, paper); **JOSEPH ANDREWS, SHAMELA**, Henry Fielding, ed. Martin Battestin (Houghton Mifflin, 1961, 370 pp., \$1.15, paper).

In his introduction, used for both books, Mr. Battestin has provided a thorough discussion of "the collision of Richardson and Fielding" which marked the beginnings of the English novel. The editor also presents both a concentrated review of relevant historical and literary background and a stimulating exegesis of *Joseph Andrews* as "the embodiment of Fielding's own conception of the art of fiction," not a second attempt to parody Richardson. Since "beyond any reasonable doubt" Fielding was the author of *Shameла*, this successful parody of *Pamela* is shown to be a superb example of Fielding's brilliance at both mimicry and burlesque.

Both editions contain a helpful chronological table and an up-to-date bibliography as well as thorough annotation of the works. Either edition would be effective as a text in English courses dealing with the eighteenth century or the novel.

KEITH C. ODOM  
Texas Christian University

**THE GATHERING STORM**, Winston S. Churchill ((Bantam, 1961, 713 pp., \$1.25, paper); **SINCE YESTERDAY**, Frederick Lewis Allen (Bantam, 1961, 292 pp., \$.60, paper).

Now available in inexpensive and unabridged paperback editions, these two titles will doubtless be found on many more reading lists. *THE GATHERING STORM*, like the five other Churchill war volumes (also scheduled to appear in paper), is a major work in both a literary and historical sense. Churchill begins the first volume of his highly personal and yet panoramic chronicle with the preliminary events of 1919 and concludes with his acceptance of the post of Prime Minister in 1940. An artist as well as a recorder, he takes as his theme "how the English-speaking peoples through their unwise, carelessness, and good nature allowed the wicked to rear."

Allen's *SINCE YESTERDAY* records in very readable prose what America was doing while Hitler prepared for war. He finds that Americans were pre-occupied in the critical years of 1929-1939 with the stock market crash, the depression, and then recovery under the New Deal. A useful background for courses in American literature and American civilization.

RICHARD F. BAUERLE  
Ohio Wesleyan University

**IN THE MIDST OF LIFE**, Ambrose Bierce (256 pp., \$.60); **THE GREAT MEADOW**, Elizabeth Madox Roberts (207 pp., \$.50); **GEORGIA BOY**, Erskine Caldwell (151 pp., \$.50); **THE MARRIAGES**, Henry James (364 pp., \$.50). Signet Classics, 1961, New American Library.

These four American titles from the Signet list of New American Library will be welcome additions for classroom use. The Bierce and Roberts volumes are particularly useful, since these authors are not as readily available in paperback editions as Caldwell and James. The Bierce collection includes the *Tales of Soldiers* and *Tales of Civilians* from the 1898 edition, four stories from *Can Such Things Be* and a very brief selection from *The Devil's Dictionary*. Marcus Cuncliffe's brief Afterword acknowledges Bierce's significance without maintaining too much for him as an author. *The Great Meadow* is a minor classic that has long deserved paperback reprint. Willard Thorp in the Afterword shows the value of the novel as history and literature. One might question the need for another Erskine Caldwell paperback, although *Georgia Boy* is generally acknowledged to be one of his better works. (Robert Cantwell has provided the Afterword to this edition.) The James volume consists of nine stories of which only "The Real Thing" is very often anthologized. The Textual Biblio-

graphical Note at the end has a useful listing of the publication history of each story followed by "relevant passages in *The Notebooks* and in the prefaces as collected in Blackmur's *The Art of the Novel*." Eleanor Tilton has written the Foreword.

GEORGE I. TITUS

George Peabody College for Teachers

**TWENTY YEARS AT HULL-HOUSE,** Jane Addams (320 pp., \$75); **THE AUTOBIOGRAPHY AND OTHER WRITINGS**, Benjamin Franklin (350 pp., \$50). New American Library 1961 Signet Classics.

This edition of Franklin, which provides an authoritative text on the *Autobiography* and some minor pieces, is an outstanding bargain. However, although there is a helpful index, the minimal annotation might restrict the book's usefulness. Jane Addam's book, unavailable in any other paperbound edition, cuts across so many areas of experience that it ought to be read by all those interested in American literature, history, and sociology. Felicitously written, it is a clear-eyed, humane view of the difficult times at the turn of the century. Both of these new editions are attractively printed and bound.

JOHN PATTON

Albright College

**HENRY JAMES: SEVEN STORIES AND STUDIES**, ed. Edward Stone (Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1961, 310 pp., \$1.95).

This contains several of James's "most challenging" stories, of which a few, like "The Marriages" or "Europe," will probably be new to the average student. Considering these the least difficult, Stone provides little commentary on them, offering up to 2500 words, however, on the better-known stories. These comments represent a wide range of tastes, from the wry, often exasperating remarks of Sean O'Faolain, to Walter F. Wright's dissenting analysis of "The Real Thing." "The Jolly Corner" produces Edward Honig's fascinating idea of the "merciful fraud" in which the disguised self is sacrificed so that the real self can reach full realization. Some teachers might prefer the whole essay to these excerpts, many very brief, others unsatisfactory because incomplete. Some might desire more comment on less familiar stories. But the critical material is well selected to stimulate classroom discussion, making this a superior "casebook" among the many now available.

JOHN PATTON  
Albright College

**TROUBLED SLEEP**, Jean-Paul Sartre (Bantam Books, 1961, 330 pp., \$75, paper); **THE SECOND SEX**, Simone de Beauvoir (Bantam Books, 1961, 705 pp., \$95, paper); **WONDERFUL WORLD OF SCIENCE**, ed. Shirley Moore and Judith Viorst (Bantam Books, 1961, 246 pp., \$50, paper).

Bantam Books has done a great service in providing these three books in paperback. Two of the titles will quickly be recognized. The third is a new book, which has not yet had a hard-cover edition.

*Troubled Sleep* and *The Second Sex* both come from a background of World War II existentialism in France, and first appeared in the United States in the early 1950s after enjoying great success on the Continent in the late 1940s.

*Troubled Sleep* is a novel set against the background of the first few weeks after the fall of France to the Nazis, the third of a series which began with *The Age of Reason* and *The Reprieve*. Such characters as Mathieu, Gomez, Boris, Daniel, and Brunet will be remembered by a large group of American readers. Sartre has tried to represent every shade of French public opinion.

*The Second Sex* is a serious study of women, which has won a solid place in the literature about this subject. (The author was a close associate of Sartre.) Originally published in two volumes, the study includes a critical view of women's problems as seen from the perspective of biology, psychology, history, historical materialism, literature, myth and mysticism (Book I). Book II deals with "Woman's Life Today": Childhood, The Young Girl, Sexual Initiation, The Lesbian, The Married Woman, The Mother, Social Life, Prostitutes and Hetairas, From Maturity to Old Age, Woman's Situation and Character, The Narcissist, The Woman in Love, The Mystic, The Independent Woman.

The *Wonderful World of Science* lists material available to parents, teachers, or students, no matter what their field of scientific interest might be. This material is described, the price is given, and the supplier is noted. The user of this book can follow up his interests to increase his knowledge or to develop a hobby.

ERWIN F. KARNER

Onarga Military School, Illinois

**JOSEPH ANDREWS**, Henry Fielding (319 pp., \$50); **A HIGH WIND IN JAMAICA**, Richard Hughes (192 pp., \$60); **THE SEA AND THE JUNGLE**, H. M. Tom-

linson (254 pp., \$.60). New American Library Signet Classics paperbacks.

Thanks to the New American Library, for \$1.70, readers can go on an odyssey and have a composite experience of weird, grotesque, nightmarish, yet amusing adventure if they read Henry Fielding's *Joseph Andrews*, Richard Hughes' *A High Wind in Jamaica*, and H. M. Tomlinson's *The Sea and the Jungle*.

Often called the first realistic novel of English literature, *Joseph Andrews* gives a true picture of manners and customs of the eighteenth century and satirizes the weaknesses of human nature, especially affectation. Fielding has written a loose, rambling novel but offers a rich, vivid portrayal of English life of these times.

*A High Wind* uses the intriguing theme of children captured by pirates. Hughes gives insights into the feelings, the reactions and the thoughts of the young prisoners and discusses the values dividing the world of children and adults. Also called *The Innocent Voyage*, it presents an eerie, macabre, and desperate voyage.

*The Sea and the Jungle*, written in 1912, is a narrative of travel and escape from London and urban mediocrity. The escape is to the sea and to the Amazon and the Rio Madeira. Mainly a nonfictional work, it contains many audacious episodes. In Tomlinson's own words *The Sea* is a "travel book for honest men."

HERMAN A. ESTRIN  
Newark College of Engineering

## INDEX

### Volumes X, XI, XII (1959, 1960, 1961)

Adams, Richard P., rvw. *The Octopus*, XI (M '60), 126-127  
 Administering the Freshman Course, XI (O '60), 167-168  
 Administrative Problems Posed by the Advanced Placement Program, Edward T. Wilcox, X (F '59), 14-18  
 Advanced Placement Program—Advantages and Cautions, Edwin H. Sauer, XI (F '60), 7-12  
 Allen, George V., Projecting the Image of America: A Problem in Communication, XII (D '61), 197-203  
 American Studies and the Freshman Course, Edward F. Grier, X (M '59), 69-71  
 Anderson, Carl L., rvws. *Adventure of Huckleberry Finn, Last of the Mohicans, Selected American Prose, 1841-1900*, XI (M '60), 126, 127  
 Approach to Freshman Writers, Alexander Karanikas, XI (F '60), 50-55  
 Arnold, Aerol, The Limits of Communication, XI (F '60), 12-16  
 Are Large Classes Just as Efficient? Orlan Sawey, X (F '59), 32  
 Arms, George, rvw. *Twelve Poets*, XI (M '60), 127  
 Among the New Texts, X (M '59), 130-131; XI (M '60), 121-128; XII (D '60), 248-252; XII (M '61), 121-128; XIII (D '61), 250-263  
 Arnton, Herbert E., Primary Material and the Research Paper, XI (D '60), 212-213  
 Attacking the One-for-One Fallacy, Robert L. Coard, XI (D '60), 217-218

Baker, Frank S., rvw. *Benjamin Franklin's Autobiography and Selected Writings*, XII (M '61), 125; *The Somers Mutiny Affair*, XI (D '60), 252  
 Baker, Joseph E., rvw. *The Idea of a University*, XI (D '60), 252  
 Baker, Orville, and William R. Seat, Jr., Freshman English at Northern Illinois University, X (M '59), 100-102  
 Baker, William D., The Writing Notebook Idea, X (D '59), 264-265  
 Baldwin, R. G., Grading Freshman Essays, XI (M '60), 110-114  
 Bartel, Roland, More on Controlled Materials, XI (D '60), 213  
 Bateman, Richard M., On the Frequency of Certain Selections in Freshman Prose Anthologies, XI (D '60), 220-223  
 Battle Plan for Freshman English, Joseph A. Rogers, X (M '59), 107-111  
 Bauerle, R. F., rvws. *Shefter's Guide to Better Compositions, The Ancient Myths, The Genius of the Irish Theater*, XII (M '61), 123, 127; *Modern American Writer, The Gathering Storm, Since Yesterday*, XII (D '61), 252-253, 261  
 Becoming a Communications Consultant in Industry, XI (O '60), 180-181  
 Belcher, William, Impromptu Theme (as entrance test), XI (F '60), 29-33; The Uses and Limitations of Entrance and Achievement Examinations in English, X (O '59), 157-158  
 Bellamy, John E., Teaching Composition by Television, XI (F '60), 36-39  
 Benefits to English Departments of the Advanced Placement Program, Gerhard Friedrich, X (F '59), 11-14  
 Better Grading of Better Themes, Robert D. Stevick, XI (D '60), 234-237  
 Bishop, Jonathan, Criteria for an Adequate Composition Course, X (D '59), 243-248  
 "Bitter with the Better," Clara M. Siggins, X (D '59), 261-262

Blackburn, Charles E., *The Program at Washington State College*, X (F '59), 7-10

Boltwood, Robert M., *Technical Writing—And English*, XI (D '60), 226-228

Book Report: *An Exercise in Insight*, Samuel J. Hazo, X (F '59), 37-38

Borrowed Titles: *Project for a Freshman Term Paper*, Frances W. McColl, XII (M '61), 96-97

Bowden, William R., *The Controversial Sentence Diagram*, XI (D '60), 201-202; *Guilt by Association: The Sentence Diagram*, X (M '59), 89-94

[Bowman, Francis E.], *The Roving Participant in Cincinnati*, XI (M '60), 114-115

Braddock, Richard R., *A Proposal for "Bar Exams,"* X (M '59), 85-88; *rvw. British and American Essays*, XI (M '60), 122; *Secretary's Report No. 35*, XII (O '61), 192-195

Braddock, Richard R., and Carl A. Dallinger, *The Rhetoric Program at the University of Iowa*, XII (D '61), 212-217

Bridging the Gap between High-School and College English, XI (O '60), 176-179

Bridging the Gap between Secondary School and College: *Cooperation in State and District Associations*, XII (O '61), 178-179

Bridging the Gap between Secondary School and College, XII (O '61), 186-187

Brinkley, W. L., Jr., *rvw. The New American Guide to Colleges*, XI (M '60), 128

Brogan, Howard O., *The Freshman Research Paper*, XI (D '60), 224-226; *Mass Education and the Development of Skills*, XII (D '61), 239-242; *Teaching Skill in English*, X (M '59), 103-105

Brown, Charles T., *Possibilities for Research in Composition and Communication*, XII (F '61), 49-52

Brown, Lurene, *Poetry and the Freshman Theme*, XII (M '61), 98-99; *rvws. Essentials of Effective Writing, Practice for Effective Writing, Concise English Handbook*, 251-253

Burke, Virginia, *Why Not Try College*, X (D '59), 231-234

Burrows, Dorothy, *Composition Research Project in Progress*, XII (F '61), 43-48

Butterworth, Harrison, *rvw. Aspects of Modern Drama*, XII (M '61), 127

Cain, R. Donald, *Guilty as an Accessory: The Sentence Diagram*, X (D '59), 210-218

Calderwood, Natalie, *rvws. Autobiography of Brook Farm, Modern Prose Form and Style, The Art of the Essay, Roget's College Thesaurus*, X (M '59), 130-131; *Mechanics of English, The Art of Poetry, Moll Flanders*, XI (M '60), 125-126

California's Subject A Examination, C. W. Jones, XI (F '60), 33-35

Campbell, Anne L., *The Five-Sensed World*, XI (M '60), 94-97

Can Freshmen Be Taught the Art of Revision? Lila Kostick Chalpin, X (D '59), 267-268

Canario, John W. See Cox, Martha H.

Cannon, Garland H., *The "Colloquial" in Freshman Writing*, X (F '59), 43-46

Case for the Controlled Materials Method, Robert P. Weeks, X (F '59), 33-35

C/C Course and the University, XII (O '61), 134-137 as General Education, XI (O '60), 145-146 for the Gifted Student, XI (O '60), 168-170; XII (O '61), 169-171 for the Technical and Engineering Student, X (O '59), 182-184

in General Education Programs, X (O '59), 187-188

in Junior Colleges, X (O '59), 179-181; (O '60), 157-159

in Large Schools and Universities, X (O '59), 184-186; XI (O '60), 161-163

in the Liberal Arts College, X (O '59), 181-182; XI (O '60), 164-166

in Technical Schools, XI (O '60), 156-157

in the Teacher-Training Program, XI (O '60), 159-161

in the Twelfth Grade, XI (O '60), 173-176

C/C Programs for the Foreign Student, X (O '59), 192-194 for the Remedial Student, X (O '59), 190-192 for the Superior College Student, X (O '59), 188-189

for the Twelfth Grade College Preparatory Student, X (O '59), 194-198

CCCC Bulletin Board, X (F '59), 64-67; X (M '59), 131-132; X (D '59), 270-272; XI (F '60), 59-61; XI (D '60), 244-247; XII (F '61), 62-64; XII (M '61), 118-120; XII (D '61), 247-249

CCCC Convention, 1959, *The Roving Reporter*, X (M '59), 124-127

CCCC Constitution and By-Laws, XII (F '61), 7-12

CCCC Placement Service, XII (F '61), 32

CCCC Standing Committee on Review of Research and Description of Projects, XII (O '61), 191-192

Chaikin, Milton, *The Workbook in Freshman Composition*, XI (M '60), 116-117

Chalpin, Lila Kostick, *Can Freshmen Be Taught the Art of Revision*, X (D '59), 267-268

Christensen, Francis, *rvws. Seeing and Writing, The Elements of Style, Student and Society*, XI (M '60), 121-123

Clifton, Ernest S., *rvws. A First Course in College English*, XII (D '61), 251; *The Written Word—Forms of Writing*, XI (D '60), 249

Coard, Robert L., *Attacking the One-for-One Fallacy*, XI (D '60), 217-218

Cohen, Morton N., *Operation Forecast: Better Writing Through Guided Research*, X (D '59), 248-252

College and University C/C Programs—Editorial Announcement, XII (M '61), 65

College Entrance Examination Board, John A. Valentine, XII (M '61), 88-92

College Freshman Composition: *How Can We Improve It?* Gordon Wilson, XII (F '61), 27-32

College Professor as Communications Consultant, XI (O '60), 133-134

College Texts: *The Problem of Choice*, Henry F. Thoma, XII (M '61), 111-114

Collins, Harold R., A. Modest Proposal for Freshman English, X (M '59), 111-113

"Colloquial" in Freshman Writing, Garland H. Cannon, X (F '59), 43-46

Committee on Experiments, State College of Washington, "Honors" English for Everyman, X (M '59), 116-120

Common Problems in the Teaching of High School and College English, XI (O '60), 141-142

Composition and Communication: Today and Tomorrow, Cecil B. Williams, XII (M '61), 83-87

Composition Research Project in Progress, Dorothy Burrows, XII (F '61), 43-48

Communication, Macklin Thomas, XI (M '60), 120

Communication Concepts of Harold Innis, Sanford Radner, X (M '59), 77-80

Communication Course: A Ten-Year Perspective, Howard H. Dean, X (M '59), 80-85

Communications Sequence on the Graduate Level, Sanford Radner, XII (D '61), 225

Controversial Sentence Diagram, William R. Bowden, XI (D '60), 201-202

Cook, Don L., rvws. *A Contemporary Reader*, XII (M '61), 124-125

Corbett, Edward P. J., rvws. *Reading and Word Study, Preface to Critical Reading, London in Dickens' Day*, XII (M '61), 121-124, 125; *Our Living Language, Science and Society, Shakespeare's Julius Caesar, Two Modern American Tragedies, Extrasensory Perception, The Hungarian Revolt*, XII (D '61), 251, 255, 258

Corder, Jim W., *The Story of Rhetoric*, XII (M '61), 93-95; rvws. *Design for Thinking, Essential Works of Stoicism, Essential Works of Descartes, Essential Works of John Stuart Mill*, XII (D '61), 250-258-259.

Cote, David D., and Lawrence A. Ruff, *A Freshman Heresy: Revise Equals Recopy*, XII (D '61), 229-233

Counter-Proposal Affecting the Future Direction of the CCCC, Eugene F. Grewe, XII (F '61), 18-22

Cox, Martha Heasley, Maxwell Anderson and Composition and Communication, X (D '59), 239-242; On "An Essay: Or Teaching Hurt Mr. Anderson," XI (M '60), 101

Cox, Martha H., John W. Canario, and James R. Cypher, *Remedial English: A Nation-Wide Survey*, XI (D '60), 237-244

Crenshaw, Troy C., rvw. *Grammar for Written English*, XII (M '61), 121

Criteria for an Adequate Composition Course, Jonathan Bishop, X (D '59), 243-248

Crosby, Harry H. rvws. *Communication Skills, Reading for Understanding*, X (M '59), 130; *A Range of Writing, Poems of Tennyson, Prose of the Victorian Age*, XI (M '60), 122-123, 127; *How and Where to Look It Up*, XI (D '61), 248

Culbert, Taylor, Methodology in Research in Composition, XII (F '61), 39-42

Current Status of the Two-Year College, XII (O '61), 131-133

Cypher, James R. See Cox, Martha H.

Dallinger, Carl A. See Braddock, Richard

Dean, Howard H., The Communication Course: A Ten-Year Perspective, X (M '59), 80-85

DeCamp, David, The *OED* in the Classroom, XII (D '61), 227-229

DeMoraunt, Walter J., Logic and Originality in Freshman Themes, X (F '59), 24-26

Determining the Quality of C/C Teaching, X (O '59), 146-148

Developing Creativity in Young Writers, X (O '59), 159-161

Devices for Promoting Institution-Wide Responsibility, XII (O '61), 187-188

Discussion of Advanced Linguistics, X (O '59), 161-162

Durham, Frederick, rvw. *Writing from Experience*, XI (D '60), 249

Eble, Kenneth E., Quality of Teachers + Quality of Profession=Quality of Teaching, XI (M '60), 85-90

Editorial Foreword, Cecil B. Williams, XII (O '61), 129-130

Editorial Policy of CCC, XII (O '61), 184-185

Education of the English Teacher for the C/C Program, X (O '59), 201-203

Elimination of Remedial English at Illinois, Harris Wilson, XII (M '61), 70-73

Embrey, Lee Anna, Proper Training in C/C for Government Writing, XII (D '61), 204-207

Emery, Donald W., Variant Spellings, XI (F '60), 55-58

English Language Program at Arizona State University, L. M. Myers, XII (M '61), 66-69

Entrance and Achievement Tests: A Symposium, XI (F '60), 26-35

Estey, George F., rvws. *College Writing and Reading*, XI (M '60), 123; *Writing College Themes*, XI (D '60), 250; *Business English and Communication*, Gregg Notehand, XII (M '61), 123; *Words in Context*, XII (D '61), 253

Estrin, Herman A., How Do You Grade a Composition, XII (D '61), 234-235; What Literature Means to Engineering Freshmen, XII (M '61), 102-106; rvws. *Effective Report Writing, Modern English Practice*, XI (M '61), 122-124; *An Introduction to Journalism*, Joseph Andrews, *A High Wind in Jamaica, The Sea and the Jungle*, XII (D '61), 255-256, 262-263

Experiments in Communication as Problem-Solving, Don Hausdorf, X (F '59), 27-32

Experiments in Freshman English, XI (O '60), 135-136

Explication of an Art Film, X (O '59), 167-168

Ferrell, Wilfred A., rvws. *Prentice-Hall Handbook for Writers, Fields of Learning*, XII (M '61), 122-124; *Practical English Handbook, A Workbook for Writers*, XII (D '61), 253-254

First Semester English and the MOE Test, Arthur R. Huseboe and Robert C. Steensma, X (F '59), 35-37

Five-Sensed World, Anne L. Campbell, XI (M '60), 94-97

Form as Communication, X (O '59), 164-165

Free Association Aids Clarity in Freshman Composition, William Sparks, X (F '59), 38-40

Freedman, Morris, Technical Writing, Anyone? X (F '59), 53-57; The Proper Place of Creative Writing Courses, XI (F '60), 22-26

French, Warren G., Visigoths and Byzantines, X (M '59), 72-77

Frequency of Certain Selections in Freshman Prose Anthologies, Richard M. Eastman, XI (D '60), 220-223

Freshman English and Northern Illinois University, Orville Baker and William R. Seat, Jr., X (M '59), 100-102

Freshman English at the University of Michigan, William R. Steinhoff, XI (F '60), 17-22

Freshman English Grades as a Clue to Student Success, Edwin T. Sandberg, X (F '59), 33

Freshman Heresy: Revise Equals Recopy, David D. Cote and Lawrence A. Ruff, XII (D '61), 229-233

Freshman Research Paper, Jack Herring, XI (D '60), 210-212

Freshman Research Paper, Howard O. Brogan, XI (D '60), 224-226

Freshman Research Paper in This Sticky-Fingered Age, A. M. Tibbets, X (M '59), 102-103

Freshman Research Papers—Once More, Everett W. Gibbs, XI (M '60), 82-84

Freshman Theme as Personal Philosophy, XI (O '60), 138-139

Freshman Whose Native Language Is Not English, XII (O '61), 155-157

Freshman Write the Darndest Things, George R. Herman, XI (M '60), 117

Friedrich, Gerhard, Benefits to English Departments of the Advanced Placement Program, X (F '59), 11-14

Future Directions for the CCCC, XII (F '61), 6-32

Gates, George G., We Who Are Afraid to Teach, X (F '59), 18-20

GE-250: The General Electric Information Searching Selector, Allen Kent, X (M '60), 75-77

Gerber, John, Report of the Committee on Future Directions, XI (F '60), 3-7

Gibbs, Everett W., Freshman Research Papers —Once More, XI (M '60), 82-84

Gifted Student and the Not-So-Gifted, Albert R. Kitzhaber, X (F '59), 5-7

Glick, Claris, rvw. *A Casebook on Gulliver among the Houyhnhnms*, XII (D '61), 258

Gorrell, Robert M., Philosophy and Structure of CCCC, XII (F '61), 14-18; The Uses and Limitations of Entrance and Achievement Examinations in English, X (O '59), 157; Uses and Limitations of Entrance Tests, XI (F '60), 26-28

Gossman, Ann, rvw. *A Milton Dictionary*, XII (D '61), 257

Gottschalk, Hans, rvw. *Interpreting Literature*, XI (D '60), 249

Grading Freshman Essays, R. G. Baldwin, XI (M '60), 110-114

Grading the C/C Theme, X (O '59), 163

Grammar and Usage in the C/C Course, XII (O '61), 167-168

Grammar in the C/C Course, X (O '59), 177-179; XI (O '60), 151-153

Graves, John, A Jot of Doubt, XII (F '61), 56-59

Green, Morton, "Nucleus," A Word of the Nuclear Age, XI (D '60), 218-219

Grewe, Eugene F., Counter-Proposal Affecting the Future Direction of the CCCC, XII (F '61), 18-22

Grieder, T. G., Jr., One New Approach to the Freshman Research Paper, X (D '59), 268-270

Grier, Edward F., American Studies and the Freshman Course, X (M '59), 69-71

Guilt by Association: The Sentence Diagram, William R. Bowden, X (M '59), 89-94

Guilty as an Accessory: The Sentence Diagram, R. Donald Cain, X (D '59), 210-218

Hall, Bita May, rvw. *Getting Along in French, Getting Along in Italian, Getting Along in Spanish, Getting Along in German, Getting Along in Russian*, XII (D '61), 259

Hamalian, Leo, Plagiarism: Suggestions for Its Cure and Prevention, X (F '59), 50-53

Hamburg Report No. 1, Cecil B. Williams, X (D '59), 209; No. 2, XI (M '60), 65-66

Hausdorf, Don, An Experiment in Communication as Problem-Solving, X (F '59), 27-32

"Having just finished grading themes—danglers sound all right to me," James T. Nardin, XI (M '60), 119-120

Hazo, Samuel J., The Book Report: An Exercise in Insight, X (F '59), 37-38

Heninger, S. K., Jr., rvw. *From Homer to Joyce*, XI (M '60), 126

Henshaw, Marjorie B., rvws. *Understanding Poetry, The History of Mr. Polly*, XII (M '61), 122, 128

Herman, George R., Freshmen Write the Darndest Things, XI (M '60), 117; rvw. *75 Prose Pieces*, (D '61), 254

Herring, Jack, The Freshman Research Paper, XI (D '60), 210-212

High School and College Teaching—A Look at Each Side, X (O '59), 165-167

High Schools and Colleges Working Together, XI (O '60), 139-140

Hoffman, Charles G., Tradition and Revolt in Freshman English, XI (M '60), 97-99

Holmes, William J., rvw. *The Classics Reclassified*, XII (M '61), 126

Holmes, William J., Jr., and Robert F. McDonnell, A Study of the Depressed Areas (freshman class size and structure), XII (D '61), 242-246

"Honors" English for Everyman, Committee on Experiments, State College of Washington, X (M '59), 116-120

Horowitz, David L., rvw. *Design for Thinking*, XII (D '61), 250-251

Houghton, Donald E., Paperback Research: Some Shortcomings, XI (D '60), 203-206; Many Voices, Many Rooms, X (D '59), 260-261

How Much English Does a Dentist Need? John Weston Howard, XI (M '60), 71-74

Howard, John Weston, How Much English Does A Dentist Need? X (M '60), 71-74

Hudson, Randolph, Teaching Technical Writing, XII (D '61), 208-212

Hume, Robert A., A Sentence a Day, XI (M '60), 90-94

Huseboe, Arthur R., and Robert C. Steensma, First Semester English and the MOE Test, X (F '59), 35-37

If Articulation Succeeds—A Cautionary View, XII (O '61), 148-149

Implications of the Advanced Placement Program, X (O '59), 134-136

Impromptu Theme (as entrance test), William Belcher, XI (F '60), 29-33

In Defense of Formal Diction, William Kenney, XI (M '60), 102-104

In Defense of Freshman English, Robert P. Saalbach, XII (D '61), 223-224

Inferences, Judgments, and Reports in Freshman Composition, William U. McDonald, Jr., X (M '59), 105-106

Intensive Communication Program for Freshman, George L. Sixbey and Paul Witherpoon, X (M '59), 99-100

Is English Composition Only for Americans? Robert D. Stevick, XII (D '61), 236-239

Is Theme Writing Really Necessary? Paul G. Wermuth, (F '59), 21-24

Ives, Sumner, rvws. *Processes in Writing, Preparatory Reading for Writing, Guide to Research Writing, English as a Second Language*, XI (M '60), 123-125; *Workbook for Understanding English*, XII (M '61), 121-122

Johnson, Falk S., Secretary's Reports Nos. 26, 27, X (M '59), 128-130; Nos. 28-29, XI (F '60), 61-64; Nos. 30-32, XI (O '60), 182-185; Nos. 33, 34, XII (F '61), 59-62

Johnson, Falk S., Structured Versus Non-structural Teaching, XI (D '60), 214-215; What Future for CCCC? XII (F '61), 13-14

Jones, C. W., California's Subject A Examination, XI (F '60), 33-35

Jones, John A., rvw. *Gulliver's Travels*, XII (D '61), 258  
Jot of Doubt, John Graves, XII (F '61), 56-59

Kallsen, T. J., rvw. *Elements of Composition*, X (D '60), 249  
Karanikas, Alexander, An Approach to Freshman Writers, XI (F '60), 50-55  
Karner, Erwin F., rvw. *Troubled Sleep, The Second Sex, Wonderful World of Science*, XII (D '61), 262  
Keeler, Clinton, Suggested Readings for a Gifted Section of Freshman English, XII (M '61), 97-98; rvw. *Democracy, Mont-Saint-Michel and Chartres*, XII (D '61), 259  
Kendall, Lyle H., rvw. *Modern Rhetoric*, XII (D '61), 252  
Kenney, William, In Defense of Formal Dictation XI (M '60), 102-104  
Kent, Allen, The GE-250: The General Electric Information Searching Selector, X (M '60), 75-77  
Kishler, Thomas C., The Novel as Primary Source in the Freshman Research Paper, XII (D '61), 225-227  
Kitzhaber, Albert R., The Gifted Student and the Not-So-Gifted, X (F '59), 5-7  
Kogan, Bernard, Three and a Half Ways of Looking at Control; or, The Controlled Paper Controlled, XI (M '60), 77-81  
Konkle, Ward, Technical Writing Improvement in the Agricultural Research Service, USDA, XII (M '61), 99-101  
Kurak, Alex, Our Exposed Linguists, X (D '59), 219-222

Lally, Sister Mary Aquin, A Structural Approach to the Freshman Theme, XI (F '60), 43-50  
Lamberts, J. J., Structural Linguistics: For Whom? XI (M '60), 105-110  
Lawson, Lewis A., National Trends in Remedial English, X (M '59), 113-115  
Letter to the Editor, James H. Mason, XII (M '61), 114-115  
Levin, David, Sourcebooks and the Freshman Research Paper, XI (F '60), 39-43  
Library Paper and the C/C Course, X (O '59), 143-146  
Limits of Communication, Aerol Arnold, XI (F '60), 12-16  
Linguistics in the C/C Course, X (O '59), 173-176; XI (O '60), 130-131; 149-151  
Literature as the Core of the C/C Course, XII (O '61), 173-175  
Literature in the C/C Course, X (O '59), 170-173; XI (O '60), 148-149  
Lloyd-Jones, Richard, rvw. *Communication in Business and Industry*, XI (D '60), 250  
Logic and Originality in Freshman Themes, Walter J. De Mordaunt, X (F '59), 24-26  
Logic in the C/C Course, X (O '59), 169-170  
Ludlum, Charles D., rvw. *A Spelling Guide and Workbook*, XI (D '60), 251

McCelvey, George, rvw. *Caleb Williams*, XII (M '61), 127-128  
McColl, Frances W., Borrowed Titles: Project for a Freshman Term Paper, XII (M '61), 96-97  
McDonald, William U., Jr., Inferences, Judgments, and Reports in Freshman Composition, X (M '59), 105-106  
McDonnell, Robert F. See Holmes, William J., Jr.

Macrorie, Ken, Writing's Dying, XI (D '60), 205-210  
Manning, Ambrose, The Present Status of the Research Paper in Freshman English: A National Survey, XII (M '61), 73-78  
Many Voices, Many Rooms, David E. Houghton, X (D '59), 260-261  
Marks, Lester J., rvw. *Woodcraft*, XII (D '61), 257

Mason, James H., A Letter to the Editor, XII (M '61), 114-115  
Mass Education and the Development of Skills, Howard O. Brogan, XII (D '61), 239-242  
"Masters" and "Slaves": A Director of Composition Looks at the Graduate Assistant, Philip R. Wiklund, X (D '59), 226-230  
Maxwell Anderson and Composition and Communication, Martha Heasley Cox, X (D '59), 239-242

Meers, Geneva, Use a Rifle, Not a Shotgun, X (D '59), 266-267

Methodology in Research in Composition, Taylor Culbert, XII (F '61), 39-42

Miller, Gerald, rvw. *The Process of Communication*, XI (D '60), 250

Modest Proposal for Freshman English, Harold R. Collins, X (M '59), 111-113

Modification in Content and Use of National Entrance and Placement Tests, XII (O '61), 165-167

Montague, Gene, rvws. *The Complete Reader, Read and Write*, XII (D '61), 254, 255

Moral Factor in Teaching Composition, George Reinfeld, XI (D '60), 216-217

More on Controlled Materials, Roland Bartel, XI (D '60), 213

More Limitations of Structural Linguistics, T. M. Pearson, XI (D '60), 229-233

Morris, William E., rvw. *Personal Integrity*, XII (D '61), 255

Motivating the Gifted Student in the C/C Program, XII (O '61), 149-151

Myers, L. M., The English Language Program at Arizona State University, XII (M '61), 66-69

Nardin, James T., "Having just finished grading themes—danglers sound all right to me," XI (M '60), 119-120

National Trends in Remedial English, Lewis A. Lawson, X (M '59), 113-115

Nault, Clifford A., Jr., rvw. A Course in Modern English, XI (D '60), 250

New Attacks on the Problem of the Unprepared Freshman, XII (O '61), 153-155

New Developments in C/C Courses, X (O '59), 136-137

New Developments in Teaching Basic Skills: Spelling, Vocabulary, Sentence, X (O '59), 155-157

New Directions in Course Content and Organization

- Communication, XII (O '61), 140-142
- Composition, XII (O '61), 139-140

New Techniques in Teaching C/C Courses, X (O '59), 137-139

Note on Interment of Grammarians, Paul Roberts, X (F '59), 58-60

Novel as Primary Source in the Freshman Research Paper, Thomas C. Kishler, XII (D '61), 225-227

Noyes, Edward S., Teaching and Testing of English, XII (F '61), 33-38

"Nucleus," A Word of the Nuclear Age, Morton Green, XII (D '60), 218-219

Objective Testing, the New Phrenology, F. C. Osenburg, XII (M '61), 106-111

Obligations of the C/C Course, XII (O '61), 157-159

Odom, Keith C., rvw. Joseph Andrews, Joseph Andrews, *Shamela*, XII (D '61), 261

OED in the Classroom, David DeCamp, XII (D '61), 227-229

On "An Essay: Or Teaching Hurt Mr. Anderson," Martha H. Cox, XI (M '60), 101

On "Maxwell Anderson and Composition and Communication," John T. Shawcross, XI (M '60), 99-101

One New Approach to the Freshman Research Paper, T. G. Grider, Jr., X (D '59), 268-270

Operation Forecast: Better Writing Through Guided Research, Morton N. Cohen, X (D '59), 248-252

Organization and Administration of the C/C Course

- Colleges, XII (O '61), 161-163
- Universities, XIII (O '61), 159-161

Organizing a Junior College English Program, Sanford Radner, X (F '59), 40-43

Osenburg, F. C., Objective Testing, the New Phrenology, XII (M '61), 106-111

Our Exposed Linguists, Alex Kurak, X (D '59), 219-222

Paperback Research: Some Shortcomings, Donald E. Houghton, XI (D '60), 203-206

Parrish, James A., Jr., Using the Panel Discussion to Teach the Short Story, XI (M '60), 118-119

Patton, John, Some Suggested Aids for the Research Paper, XII (M '61), 95-96; rvws. Playwriting, Twenty Years at Hull House, Henry James: Seven Stories and Studies, The Autobiography and Other Writings, XII (D '61), 256-257, 262

Paulits, Bro. Joseph F., F.S.C., Slides and Composition, X (F '59), 47-50

Pearson, T. M., Some Limitations of Structural Grammar, X (D '59), 222-225; More Limitations of Structural Linguistics, XI (D '60), 229-233

Phillips, Phyllis, The Remedial Writing Laboratory at Pan American College, X (M '59), 106-107

Philosophy and Structure of CCCC, Robert M. Gorrell, XII (F '61), 14-18

Pierce, Marvin, rvw. Studies in the Short Story, XII (M '61), 127

Plagiarism: Suggestions for Its Cure and Prevention, Leo Hamalian, X (F '59), 50-53

Plea against the "Great" Greats, Edward Stone, X (M '59), 121-124

Poetry and the Freshman Theme, Lurene Brown, XII (M '61), 98-99

Points of View in the Philosophy of Communication, X (O '59), 148-150

Polk, Estus C., rvw. *Great Expectations*, XII (M '61), 127

Popular Culture and the Freshman: Three Questions, James Steel Smith, X (D '59), 253-259

Possibilities for Research in Composition and Communication, Charles T. Brown, XII (F '61), 49-52

Preparation in C/C Needed by the Secondary School Teacher, XII (O '61), 171-173

Present Status of the Research Paper in Freshman English: A National Survey, Ambrose N. Manning, XII (M '61), 73-78

Primary Material and the Research Paper, Herbert E. Arnton, XI (D '60), 212-213

Problem of Numbers in the C/C Course, X (O '59), 139-140

Problems in Linguistics, XI (O '60), 137-138

Problems in Technical Writing, XI (O '60), 144-145

Problems of the C/C Course in the Two-year Colleges, XII (O '61), 175-177

Proficient Reading—Proficient Writing, XII (O '61), 137-139

Professional Letters and the Teaching of English, Alan Swallow, XI (M '60), 66-70

Program at Washington State College, Charles E. Blackburn, X (F '59), 7-10

Programs for the Future Teacher of C/C Courses: College, X (O '59), 199-201

Programs for Improving Preparation in the Secondary School, XII (O '61), 146-148

Programs for the Future Teacher of C/C Courses: Elementary and Secondary Schools, X (O '59), 198-199

Projecting the Image of America: A Problem in Communication, George V. Allen, XII (D '61), 197-203

Proper Place of Creative Writing Courses, Morris Freedman, XI (F '60), 22-26

Proper Training in C/C for Government Workers, XII (O '61), 188-191

Proper Training in C/C for Government Writing, Lee Anna Embrey, XII (D '61), 204-207

Proposal for "Bar Exams," Richard Braddock, X (M '59), 85-88

Quality of Teachers+Quality of Profession=Quality of Teaching, Kenneth E. Eble, XI (M '60), 85-90

Radner, Sanford, Communication Concepts of Harold Innis, X (M '59), 77-80; Communications Sequences on the Graduate Level, XII (D '61), 228; Organizing a Junior College English Program, X (F '59), 40-43

Reardon, Kenneth, rvw. *Treasury of the Theatre*, XI (D '60), 251

Rebuttal to Dr. Edward Stone's A Plea Against the "Great" Greats, Robert Russell, X (D '59), 262-264

Recent Developments in Certification and Teacher Education, X (O '59), 141-143

Reinfeld, George, The Morale Factor in Teaching Composition, XI (D '60), 216-217

Remedial English: A Nationwide Survey, Martha H. Cox, John W. Canario, and James R. Cypher, XI (D '60), 237-244

Remedial Writing Laboratory at Pan American College, Phyllis Phillips, X (M '59), 106-107

Remington, Fred, Television—The Overcriticized Medium, X (M '59), 95-98

Report of the Committee on Future Directions, John Gerber, Chairman, XI (F '60), 3-7

Reports of Section Meetings of Workshops—1959 Convention, X (O '59), 204-207

Research in C/C, XI (O '60), 129-130; 170-172

Results and Cost of Eleven Semesters of Sub-freshman English Instruction, George S. Wykoff, XII (D '61), 217-223

Rhetoric Program at the University of Iowa, Richard Braddock and Carl A. Dallinger, XII (D '61), 212-217

Rhetoric—the Neglected Art, XII (O '61), 177-178

Roberts, Paul, Note on Interment of Grammarians, X (F '59), 58-60

Rogers, Joseph A., *A Battle Plan for Freshman English*, X (M '59), 107-111; *rvw. Essays in the American Catholic Tradition*, XI (D '60), 252; *Secretary's Reports Nos. 23-25*, X (F '59), 61-63

Role of Certification and Accreditation in the Preparation of English Teachers, Eugene E. Slaughter, XI (D '60), 195-199

Roving Participant in Cincinnati, [Francis E. Bowman], XI (M '60), 114-115

Roving Participant in Washington, D.C., [Cecil B. Williams], XII (M '61), 116-118

Roving Reporter, CCCC Convention, 1959, X (M '59), 124-127

Ruff, Lawrence A. See Cote, David D.

Russell, Robert, *A Rebuttal to Dr. Edward Stone's A Plea Against the "Great" Greats*, X (D '59), 262-264

Rutgers Plan, XII (O '61), 151-153

Ryan, Marjorie, *rvw. Literary Types and Themes*, XI (M '60), 122

Saalbach, Robert F., *In Defense of Freshman English*, XII (D '61), 223-224

Sandberg, Edwin T., *Freshman English Grades as a Clue to Student Success*, X (F '59), 33

Sauer, Edwin H., *The Advanced Placement Program—Advantages and Cautions*, XI (F '60), 7-12

Sawey, Orlan, *Are Large Classes Just as Efficient?* X (F '59), 32

Schiffman, Joseph, *rvw. The Arts of Reading*, XI (D '60), 251-252

Schwerman, Esther, *rvw. Projects in Oral Interpretation*, XI (M '60), 127

Seat, William R., Jr. See Baker, Orville.

Secretary's Reports, Nos. 23-25, Joseph A. Rogers, X (F '59), 61-63; Nos. 26, 27, Falk S. Johnson, X (M '59), 128-130; Nos. 28-29, Falk S. Johnson, XI (F '60), 61-64; Nos. 30-32, Falk S. Johnson, XI (O '60), 182-185; Nos. 33, 34, Falk S. Johnson, XII (F '61), 59-62; No. 35, Richard R. Braddock, XII (O '61), 192-195

Semantics in the C/C Course, X (O '59), 176; XI (O '60), 153-155

Sentence a Day, Robert A. Hume, XI (M '60), 90-94

Seven Tools for Evaluating Research Data, Hargis Westerfield, X (F '59), 35

Shawcross, John T., *On "Maxwell Anderson and Composition and Communication*, XI (M '60), 99-101

Siggins, Clara M., *"The Bitter with the Better,"* X (D '59), 261-262; *We Who Are Not Afraid to Teach*, XI (D '60), 199-200; *rvws. Readings and Assignments, Five Short Novels, Akhmanova Russian Dictionary, Hitler: A Study in Tyranny, The Operators, Sweet Thursday, The Heart Is a Lonely Hunter, 50 Great Poets*, XII (D '61), 254, 260-261

Sixbey, George L., and Paul Witherspoon, *An Intensive Communication Program for Freshmen*, X (M '59), 99-100

Skipp, Francis E. *rvw. American Literary Forms*, XI (D '60), 248

Slaughter, Eugene, *The Role of Certification and Accreditation in the Preparation of English Teachers*, XI (D '60), 195-199

Slides and Composition, Bro. F. Joseph Paulits, F.S.C., X (F '59), 47-50

Slothower, William R., *Structural Grammar in Programs of Preparation of Teachers of High School English*, XI (D '60), 189-195

Smith, James Steel, *Poular Culture and the Freshman: Three Questions*, X (D '59), 253-259

Smith, Robert A., *Measuring English Proficiency Beyond the Freshman Year*, XII (F '61), 53-56

Snyder, Karl E., *rvw. The Craft of Writing*, XII (M '61), 124

Some Limitations of Structural Grammar, T. M. Pearson, X (D '59), 222-225

Some Methods and Values of the Integrated C/C Course, X (O '59), 150-152

Some Remarks on the Future of the Required Course in Freshman Composition, William Steinhoff, XII (F '61), 23-26

Some Suggested Aids for the Research Paper, John Patton, XII (M '61), 95-96

Sourcebooks and the Freshman Research Paper, David Levin, XI (F '60), 39-43

Spacks, Patricia Meyer, *Special Student, Special Section*, X (D '59), 234-238

Sparke, William, *Free Association Aids Clarity in Freshman Composition*, X (F '59), 38-40

Special Problems in the Linguistics Area, X (O '59), 154-155

Special Problems of the C/C Course in Technical Schools, XII (O '61), 163-165

Special Student, Special Section, Patricia Meyer Spacks, X (D '59), 234-238

Speech in the C/C Course, XI (O '60), 147

Spencer, T. J., *rvw. Words and Ideas*, XI (M '60), 121-122

Staff Room Interchange, X (F '59), 32-40; X (M '59), 99-107; XI (D '59), 260-270 XI (M '60), 116-120; XII (D '60), 210-219; XII (M '61), 93-99; XII (D '61), 223-229

Staples, Roger C., *Subtitles and Structure in the Essay*, XI (D '60), 215-216

Status of the Profession, Priscilla Tyler, XII (M '61), 79-83

Steenisma, Robert C. See Huseboe, Arthur R.

Stevick, Robert D., *Better Grading of Better Themes*, XI (D '60), 234-237; *Is English Composition Only for Americans?* XII (D '61), 236-239

Steinhoff, William R., *Freshman English at the University of Michigan*, XI (F '60), 17-22; *Some Remarks on the Future of the Required Course in Freshman Composition*, XII (F '61), 23-26

Stillians, Bruce, *rvw. The Egoist*, XI (D '60), 252

Stone, Edward, *A Plea against the "Great" Greats*, X (M '59), 121-124; *rvw. The Humanities in Contemporary Life*, XI (M '60), 122

Story of Rhetoric, Jim W. Corder, XII (M '61), 93-95

Structural Approach to the Freshman Theme, Sister Mary Aquin Lally, XI (F '60), 189-195

Structural Grammar in Programs of Preparation of Teachers of High-School English, William R. Slothower, XI (D '60), 189-195

Structural Linguistics in the C/C Classroom, XII (O '61), 168-169

Structural Linguistics: For Whom? J. J. Lambererts, XI (M '60), 105-110

Structured Versus Non-Structural Teaching, Falk S. Johnson, XI (D '60), 214-215

Study of the Depressed Areas (freshman class size and structure), William J. Holmes, Jr., and Robert F. McDonnell, XII (D '61), 242-246

Subtitles and Structure in the Essay, Roger C. Staples, XI (D '60), 215-216

Suggested Readings for a Gifted Section of Freshman English, Clinton Keeler, XII (M '61), 97-98

Swallow, Alan Swallow, Professional Letters and the Teaching of English, XI (M '60), 66-70

Teaching and Testing of English, Edward S. Noyes, XII (F '61), 35-38

Teaching Composition by Television, John E. Bellamy, XI (F '60), 36-39

Teaching Machines and Programed Instruction, XII (O '61), 181-183

Teaching Skill in English, Howard O. Brogan, X (M '59), 103-105

Teaching Technical Writing, Randolph Hudson, XII (D '61), 208-212

Teaching the C/C Course by Television, X (O '59), 152-154

Technical Writing—And English, Robert M. Boltwood, XI (D '60), 226-228

Technical Writing, Anyone? Morris Freedman, X (F '59), 53-57

Technical Writing Improvement in the Agricultural Research Service, USDA, Ward Konkle, XII (M '61), 99-101

Television—The Over-Criticized Medium, Fred Remington, X (M '59), 95-98

Textbook Writing and Publishing, XI (O '60), 142-143

Thoma, Henry F., College Texts: The Problem of Choice, XII (M '61), 111-114

Thomas, Macklin, Communication, XI (M '60), 120

Three and a Half Ways of Looking at Control; or The Controlled Paper Controlled, Bernard Kogan, X (M '60), 77-81

Tibbets, A. M., The Freshman Research Paper in This Sticky-Fingered Age, X (M '59), 102-103

Titus, Warren I., rvws. *Heart of Darkness*, *Twelve Short Stories*, *The Scarlet Letter*, XII (M '61), 125-128; *Candide*, *Fathers and Sons*, *Robinson Crusoe*, *The Farm*, *In the Midst of Life*, *The Great Meadow*, *Georgia Boy*, *The Marriages*, XII (D '61), 259-260, 261-262

Tradition and Revolt in Freshman English, Charles G. Hoffman, XI (M '60), 97-99

Tyler, Priscilla, The Status of the Profession, XII (M '61), 79-83

Use a Rifle, Not a Shotgun, Geneva Meers, X (D '59), 266-267

Use and Abuse of Controlled Materials for the Research Paper, XII (O '61), 180-181

Use of Paperbacks in the C/C Course, XII (O '61), 142-144

Uses and Limitations of Entrance and Achievement Examinations in English, X (O '59), 157-158

Uses and Limitations of Entrance Tests, Robert Gorrell, XI (F '60), 26-28

Using the Mass Media in the C/C Course, XI (O '60), 131-132

Using the Panel Discussion to Teach the Short Story, James A. Parrish, Jr., XI (M '60), 118-119

Valentine, John A., The College Entrance Examination Board, XII (M '61), 88-92

Variant Spellings, Donald W. Emery, XI (F '60), 55-58

Vest, Eugene B., rvws. *Plutarch: Eight Great Lives*, *An Anthology of Roman Drama*, XI (D '60), 251

Visigoths and Byzantines, Warren G. French, X (M '59), 72-77

Ward, Ferdinand J., C. M., rvws. *Toward Better Writing, Using Words Effectively*, *Business English*, *Business Reports*, XI (M '60), 124, 125, 128; *The Teaching of English in the South*, *Business Communication for Better Human Relations*, *Report Writing for Business*, XII (D '61), 250, 256

Wartofsky, Marx W., rvw. *Fallacy, The Counterfeit of Argument*, XI (M '60), 124-125

We Who Are Afraid to Teach, George G. Gates, X (F '59), 18-20

We Who Are Not Afraid to Teach, Clara M. Siggins, XI (D '60), 199-200

Webster, David H., rvws. *Fundamentals of Present-Day English*, *The Short Story and the Reader*, *The Ambassadors*, XI (D '60), 250-252; *Selected Prose and Poetry*, *Southern Stories*, XII (M '61), 125

Weeks, Robert P., The Case for the Controlled Materials Method, X (F '59), 33-35

Wermuth, Paul G., Is Theme Writing Really Necessary? (F '59), 21-24

Westerfield, Hargis, Seven Tools for Evaluating Research Data, X (F '59), 35

What Future for CCCC? Falk S. Johnson, XII (F '61), 13-14

What Literature Means to Engineering Freshmen, Herman A. Estrin, XII (M '61), 102-106

Why Not Try College, Virginia M. Burke, X (D '59), 231-234

Wiklund, Philip R., "Masters" and "Slaves": A Director of Composition Looks at the Graduate Assistant, X (D '59), 226-230; rvw. *Thoreau: Man of Concord*, XII (D '61), 257

Wilcox, Edward T., Administrative Problems Posed by the Advanced Placement Program, X (F '59), 14-18

Williams, Cecil B., Composition and Communication: Today and Tomorrow, XII (M '61), 83-87; Editorial Foreword, XII (M '61), 129-130; Hamburg Report No. 1, X (D '59), 209; No. 2, XI (M '60), 65-66; rvw. *Machines and the Man* and *A Casebook on the Beat*, XII (M '61), 126

Williams, Cecil B.J., CCCC Convention, 1959, X (M '59), 124-127; The Roving Participant in Washington, D.C., XII (M '61), 116-118

Williams, George, rvw. *Selective Bibliography for the Study of English and American Literature*, XI (D '60), 248

Wilson, Gordon, College Freshman English: How Can We Improve It? XII (F '61), 27-32

Wilson, Harris, Elimination of Remedial English at Illinois, XII (M '61), 70-73

Witherspoon, Paul. See Sixbey, George L.

Workbook in Freshman Composition, Milton Chaikin, XI (M '60), 116-117

Writing's Dying, Ken Macrorie, XI (D '60), 206-210

Writing for the Federal Government, XII (O '61), 180-181

Writing Notebook Idea, William D. Baker, X (D '59), 264-265

Wykoff, George S., Results and Cost of Eleven Semesters of Subfreshman English Instruction, XII (D '61), 217-223

Year's Work in Linguistics, XII (O '61), 145-146



C

CCCC  
CATF  
DUDI  
FRAZ  
WILL  
N  
ERNE  
LUCH  
I  
MAR  
HAR  
SARA  
EARL  
HERI  
F  
EDIT  
C  
GERI  
HAN  
C  
KING  
WILL  
C  
THE  
KEN  
L. M  
STER  
I

# National Council of Teachers of English

## Conference on College Composition and Communication

### 1961 OFFICERS

ERWIN R. STEINBERG, Chairman  
Carnegie Institute of Technology

FRANCIS E. BOWMAN, Associate Chairman  
Duke University

ROBERT M. GORRELL, Assistant Chairman  
University of Nevada

RICHARD R. BRADDOCK, Secretary  
State University of Iowa

JAMES R. SQUIRE, Treasurer  
508 S. Sixth St., Champaign, Ill.

CECIL B. WILLIAMS, Editor  
Texas Christian University

### EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

CCCC Officers and  
CATHERINE ADLER, Joliet Junior College  
DUDLEY BAILEY, University of Nebraska  
FRANK S. BAKER, Hanover College, Indiana  
WILLIAM D. BAKER, State University of  
New York, Albany  
ERNEST S. CLIFTON, North Texas State University  
LUCILE CLIFTON, Ball State Teachers College,  
Indiana

MARSHALL R. CRAIG, Brigham Young University  
HARRY CROSBY, Boston University  
SARA DE FORD, Goucher College  
EARLE G. ELEY, Chicago City Junior College  
HERMAN A. ESTRIN, Newark College of  
Engineering  
EDITH FRELIGH, American River Junior College,  
California  
GERHARD G. FRIEDRICH, Cedar Crest College  
HANS GOTTSCHALK, State University of New York,  
Geneseo  
KING HENDRICKS, Utah State University  
WILLIS C. JACKMAN, University of Illinois,  
Chicago  
THEODORE J. KALLSEN, Stephen F. Austin College  
KEN MACRORIE, San Francisco State College  
L. M. MYERS, Arizona State University  
STERLING P. OLMSSTED, Rensselaer Polytechnic  
Institute

MARGERY ROBINSON, Fort Dodge Junior College

JOSEPH SCHIFFMAN, Dickinson College,  
Pennsylvania

WILLIAM STEINHOFF, University of Michigan

PAUL R. SULLIVAN, Georgetown University

DONALD R. TUTTLE, Fenn College, Ohio

HOWARD P. VINCENT, Illinois Institute of Technology

DAVID WEBSTER, Temple University

EDGAR WHAN, Ohio University

### EDITORIAL BOARD

HERMAN A. ESTRIN, Newark College of Engineering  
L. M. MYERS, Arizona State University  
PAUL ROBERTS, San Jose State College  
EDWARD STONE, Ohio University  
PRISCILLA TYLER, Harvard University  
PHILIP R. WIKELUND, Indiana University

### REPRESENTATIVE TO N.C.T.E. COLLEGE SECTION

ROBERT E. TUTTLE, General Motors Institute

### MEMBERS OF N.C.T.E. BOARD OF DIRECTORS

RICHARD S. BEAL, Boston University

MRS. MARGARET BLICKLE, Ohio State

MARGARET M. BRYANT, Brooklyn College

# *Thirteenth Annual Meeting*

**Conference on College Composition and Communication**

**Morrison Hotel      Chicago**

**April 5-7, 1962**

**Program Chairman: Priscilla Tyler, Harvard University**

**Local Chairman: Bernard Kogan, University of Illinois, Chicago**

**2406**

